THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY REVIEW

)L. LII. No. 349 JULY, 1949

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Editorial

What is Mysticism ? - - - - - - *John Byrom*

The Gospel in the Old Testament according to Hebrews - - - - *Anthony Hanson*

American Letter: No. 3 - - - - *Alden Drew Kelley*

The Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass in the Swedish Church - - - *Gunnar Rosendal*

Tract Cases - - - - - - *W. K. Lowther Clarke*

For full list of contents see within.

Edited by Alec R. Vidler at Windsor Castle, and published by the S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

per copy. 12s. per annum, post free.

ie U.S.A. $3.60 payable to the Macmillan Co., 60 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, N.Y.

THEOLOGY

Editorial communications should be addressed to: The Rev. Alec R. Vidler, D.D., 8, The Cloisters, Windsor Castle, Berks. (MSS should not exceed 3,500 words, and should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed envelope.)

Business communications (including books for review) to: The S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2.

Advisory Committee

Montgomery Belgion
The Rev. Frank Bennett
The Rev. L. J. Collins
The Rev. W. W. S. March
The Rev. Prof. E. C. Ratcliff
The Rev. Prof. Norman Sykes, D.Phil.

***Editorial Representative in the U.S.A.*: The Rev. W. Norman Pittenger, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York City**

CONTENTS

		PAGE
Editorial		241
What is Mysticism?	*John Byrom*	242
The Gospel in the Old Testament according to Hebrews	*Anthony Hanson*	248
American Letter: No. 3	*Alden Drew Kelley*	252
The Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass in the Swedish Church	*Gunnar Rosendal*	259
Tract Cases	*W. K. Lowther Clarke*	261
Correspondence:		
The Ministry	*Eric Kemp and Norman Sykes*	263
The First Word from the Cross	*A. H. Dammers*	266
Book Reviews:		
Austin Farrer, *A Rebirth of Images*	*W. Manson*	266
Ernest Evans, *Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas*	*H. Chadwick*	269
Étienne Gilson, *Dante the Philosopher*	*F. J. E. Raby*	270
Hans Ehrenberg, *Vom Menschen*	*Reginald Fuller*	272
B. J. Kelly, *The Armour of Christ*	*Cyril Gardner*	274
H. J. E. Rattenbury, *The Eucharistic Hymns of John and Charles Wesley*	*F. H. Durnford*	275
J. V. L. Casserley, *The Christian in Philosophy*	*E. L. Mascall, O.G.S.*	276
Shorter Notices		278
Books Received		280

THEOLOGY

VOL. LII JULY, 1949 No. 349

Editorial

IN *The Interpretation of History* (1936) Professor Paul Tillich referred to a proposal, meant symbolically rather than literally, that the Church should impose a thirty-year silence upon all its archetypal words (p. 47). That the archetypal words of the Bible and the liturgy have been robbed of their emotive power is sadly evident. When they are spoken either nothing whatever happens, no communication occurs, or a meaning different from, and perhaps the opposite of, the original is received. Who does not know this deafness in himself, or this failure to be moved by what has become a foreign language, or—what is worst of all—the assumption that he can understand quite easily what is being said?

There would be no remedy in a temporary suppression of the great words of the Gospel, as though they would startle us into understanding if the pretence could be made that they had been just discovered. They are not and they never can be novelties. Nor can substitutes be found for them. In *The Shaking of the Foundations* (S.C.M. Press, 10s. 6d.), Prof. Tillich returns to the subject. "There is," he says, "a mysterious fact about the great words of our religious tradition: they cannot be replaced. All attempts to make substitutions, including those I have tried myself, have failed to convey the reality that was to be expressed; they have led to shallow and impotent talk. There are no substitutes for words like 'sin' and 'grace.' But there *is* a way of rediscovering their meaning, the same way that leads us down into the depth of our human existence. In that depth these words were conceived; and *there* they gained power for all ages: *there* they must be found again by each generation, and by each of us for himself" (pp. 153 f.).

The Shaking of the Foundations is a collection of twenty-two sermons which touch the springs of this rediscovery like no other sermons that we have heard or read. They are not sermons that could suitably be preached in your parish church next Sunday. Prof. Tillich is a preacher for preachers and a theologian for theologians. These are sermons for preachers who are ready to enter deeply into what is being said, and who at the same time know that they have a much harder task than just to repeat what they hear. They have to discover ways of saying it again in the most concrete and local and personal terms that are possible. This will hardly be done except where a very sensitive pastoral relationship exists.

These are sermons for theologians. They were most of them delivered in the Union Theological Seminary in New York. But they are for lay as well as professional theologians. It is by speaking such as that of which this book contains the record that laymen will come

to see that theology deals with the deepest realities of personal and social and historical existence.

"Our time is a time of waiting; waiting is its special destiny. And every time is a time of waiting, waiting for the breaking in of eternity. All time runs forward. All time, both in history and in personal life, is expectation. Time itself is waiting, waiting not for another time but for that which is eternal" (p. 152).

What is Mysticism?

The question is unfortunate. For it conveys the impression that there is such a thing as Mysticism existing in its own right as a sort of self-contained system, alternative and generally antagonistic to the doctrines of the Christian religion. That is not the case. For if we define the mystic in the broadest terms as one who seeks for, or has attained to, union with God, then his way of life, his "mysticism," will be governed entirely by the nature of the Deity, or his own understanding of the nature of the Deity with whom he seeks union. So that there may be a Buddhist, or there may be a Tibetan, or there may be a Christian mysticism, according to the religion of the mystic, but no such thing as Mysticism in general. There are mystical systems, systems of mystical theology inside or abstracted from the various religions, from which they assume their distinctive colour; but there is no further abstraction from these systems, which can be called or recognized as Mysticism, existing as a self-contained system in isolation from the living religions or philosophies of the world.

In what follows, therefore, an attempt will be made, first, to define Christian mysticism, in particular western Christian mysticism, and secondly, to consider how we may achieve, or rather be raised to, the End and Object with which it is concerned. And for the sake of brevity Mysticism will mean Christian Mysticism. Two points, however, will be stressed or assumed throughout. First, that the mystical life is open to all, and in no way confined to the monastic, priestly, or leisured spiritual life; and secondly, that the mystical life cannot flourish outside the home, the restraints, the fellowship, the sacraments, in short, the life of the Mother who bore us, the Catholic Christian Church on earth.

What, then, is Mysticism? The abstract noun Mysticism, which first appears in English literature in the first half of the eighteenth century, derives, obviously enough, from the adjective "mystical," which, as far as we know, was first used in Christian circles by Dionysius the Areopagite, in his Treatise on Mystical Theology, late in the fifth or early in the sixth century; and it is due to his influence that the word became current, after a long lapse of time, in the twelfth century. But the accepted word for mystical, until that time, was always contemplative, while contemplation, the whole art and science of the love and contemplation of God, stood for what we now call Mysticism. "This night," says St John of the Cross

(*Sp. Cant.* xxxviii, 9), speaking of the obscure darkness of mind in which the light of God is somehow seen, "this night . . . is contemplation; for contemplation is dark, and for that reason is called by its other name, 'mystical theology'—which is the secret and hidden wisdom of God, wherein, without noise of words, and without the service or aid of any bodily or spiritual sense, as in the silence and quiet of night, hidden by darkness from all that is of the sense and of nature, God teaches the soul after a most hidden and secret manner, without her knowing how." "It is the secret science of God, the secret science of love, which spiritual men call contemplation," which in turn is a particular kind of Christian prayer. "The word 'mystical,'" says Butler in his book on Western Mysticism, "should be jealously reserved for its proper traditional religious sense, given it in the beginning by Dionysius—the secret knowledge or perception of God in contemplation."

Thus Mysticism is religion on its experimental, practical, personal side, and as such it is simply one element in religion, one, at any rate, in the Christian religion. It must not and, if it is to remain healthy and Christian, cannot be allowed to displace the other two elements, the intellectual and the institutional. "Mysticism in its most exclusive and concentrated form," said Von Hügel, "is that attitude of mind in which all other relations are swallowed up in the relation of the soul of God." It is simply the science of the soul's union with God, "first-hand religion," as Chandler described it.

To say such things at the present time, however, is to lay oneself open to the strictures which flow out with wearisome regularity from various modern writers against the mystics and the mystical tradition. The mystics are called individualists, and they are one and all pronounced guilty of the now unpardonable sin of having no sense of the Church. But are they guilty? Was there ever a man with a stronger sense of the Church or his responsibility to it than St Paul, St Augustine, or St Bernard, three giants amongst the mystics? Did any men or women submit their judgment or their lives to the mind of the Church or the Bible with greater humility and alacrity than St John of the Cross, St Teresa, St Francis de Sales, or Von Hügel; or were any so filled with the love of the brethren as St John, St Benedict, or Newman? Surely not. There have been aberrations indeed; but judged by its pure fruit, which includes many names unknown to history, the mystical tradition has been a pure blessing to the Church. The real individualists, from whom can come nothing but harm to the Church, are those who suppose that mystical writings are superior to Scripture, and that a mystical life is a way of higher knowledge, suitable for latter day gnostics and theosophists, instead of a way of suffering and humility, in union with the ascended Christ, within the visible, intellectual, and spiritual restraints of an institutional life in the Catholic Church.

We are indeed the people of God, brought into being through a covenant of grace and the common gift of the Spirit at Pentecost; we are members of Christ before anything else; but this is precisely what enables and compels us to become individuals, fully grown

men. To use C. S. Lewis's analogy, it is the salt of Christ's indwell ing that brings out the flavour in each of us, the warmth of God' love drawing us out like plants to our full growth and hence ou essential distinctness from every other creature, which in turn make up the richness of the Church's life. Love itself, on the human or th heavenly level, individualizes and makes persons of us, and so rob us of that egoism, that sense of *meum proprium* which makes u individualists and makes marriage, either human or spiritual, im possible. Membership of the covenant people, of the Church, doe not excuse individual responsibility before God, or the pain o mature individuality. We may not hide from Death or Judgmen either behind the cosy fortifying human comfort of the crowde dance-hall, nor yet behind the prayers of the Church. "No man ma deliver his brother," says the Psalmist, "nor make agreement unt God for him." We have each to go alone to God, even though we g clothed in Christ's merits. But neither does our essential separat ness within the Body forbid, rather it necessitates the followin after, that holiness without which no man shall see God; that sam holiness which transforms us from individualists into living ind viduals capable of loving and becoming parts of one another. It i if anything, the mediocrity of average present-day Church life whic makes the individual desire for union with God seem like ind vidualism, instead of the normal aspiration of all whom Christ ha bought. There can be no richness in the Body unless each membe is living, drawing its full supply of life directly from the Head.

But to return. Christian mystical theology is concerned with th Christian's union with God, and it is the consistent claim of th mystics, those who have persevered in and mastered contemplativ prayer, that it is possible for the soul, while still in this life, to e perience God's Being and Nature by a dim yet direct perceptio St Augustine relates the supreme experience of his life in two line "My mind in the flash of a trembling glance," he said, "came to tha which is," that is, to God. "God is seen," says St Thomas Aquina "in contemplation by a means which is the light of wisdom, whic uplifts the soul to perceive the divine." "The end I have in view, wrote St John of the Cross, in the *Ascent of Mt. Carmel*, "is th union of the soul with the divine substance. In this loving obscu knowledge" (which we have of God in contemplation), "God unit Himself with the soul divinely." "When the mind, employed i prayer," wrote Gregory the Great, "pants after the form of i Maker, burning with divine longings, it is united to that which above . . . and with longing desire in a marvellous way it tastes th very thing that it longs for." Similarly, St Bernard. "Contemplatio is concerned with the certainty of things, the soul's true and certai intuition of a thing, the unhesitating apprehension of Truth" (*D Consid.* ii, 5). "In it the soul experiences an inpoured savour of th heavenly sweetness (*Ser.* xxxi, 7) . . . in which the soul is drawn int the secret of the divinity" (xlix, 4). "I sought my God," says Augus ine (*Enarr. in Ps.* xli, 7), "that if possible I might not only belie but even see somewhat." And finally (*De Quant An.* 74, 76), "th

oul in contemplation will arrive at that most high and secret re-
ard, for the sake of which it has so laboured; and in which are
uch joys, such a full enjoyment of the highest and truest Good,
uch a breath of serenity and eternity, as are not to be described."

This, then, is the claim which the mystics of all ages have made,
hat a dim yet direct perception of God is open to all men of good-
ill while still in this life; and before we move on, it will be as well
o remind ourselves that this claim goes no further than, if indeed
ometimes as far as, the unqualified assurance of Jesus, that the pure
hall see God. But it would be useless to attempt to prove their
laim, since most of us are not in possession of the only valid
vidence by which to disprove it—namely, the actual experience of
heir visions of God, not as they described them but as they experi-
nced them, two different things. The fact that the Christian saints
f all ages speak the same language of awe and joy and unmovable
ertainty in God, and this coupled with the almost dazzling purity
f their lives, under all manner of human trials and difficulties—
hese things together should convince us that what they were saying
as only the truth.

And so we come to the second of the queries with which we began.
low may this glory be come by?—the question which involves all
thers relating to Mysticism. How can this vision of God, dim and
eeting as it is at its best in this life—how can this be attained?

We begin with God Himself, the Alpha and Omega, beginning
nd end of all spiritual life, "God, the divine Spirit," as Von Hügel
alled Him, "who is within, before, and after all our highest dignity
nd our deepest disquiet." It is God's love, moving upon the face
f the earth, made known in Jesus, working through the Holy
host in every subtle way, and witnessed to by the Church; it is this
reat love which calls forth our love, and, if we are faithful, raises
to a height and heat and strength and tenacity which escape the
ower of language. And it is through the increase of our love under
he action of God's grace-giving love that God unites Himself to
he soul and makes it His home.

So that the mystical life is not a life of spiritual self-culture, but
life of ceaseless, costly response to the calls of God's ubiquitous
nrelenting grace. "The whole life of a Christian man," said August-
ne, "becomes an holy desire. . . . That is our life, to be exercised
y longing" (in *Ep. Jo. Tr.* iv, 6), the longing excited in our souls
y God's touch.

And it is from this longing that works of love and self-denial flow
ut in profusion. None knew better than the mystics that our justifica-
on is by faith; but none knew better than they how costly and neces-
ry and difficult are the works which correspond to such faith. They
w that all such good works must be offered up to God not as
arter for salvation earned, but in the spirit of the unprofitable
rvant who did only what it was his duty to do. St Paul, it is not
ways remembered, did not denounce the Gospel doctrine of sal-
ation by works (*e.g.*, 1 Tim. vi, 18, 19), but the quite different doc-
ine of salvation by faith in good works.

It may also be remarked that the union with God to which t active longing raises us does not involve absorption in God. "F He wishes," says Ruysbroeck, "to give us Himself, whole and enti and all that He is; and He asks us in return to give Him our wh selves, and all that we are. And thus He wishes that we should entirely His, and He entirely ours, each none the less remaini what he is, for we cannot become God, but are united to Him bc mediately and immediately." We are glued to God by love; a what we lose in this union is not our individuality, but that fall desire to have our own existence over against and apart from Go

Nor again do we seek for union with a God of passive imperso Aristotelian Perfection, but a God who is love and light, into whi He calls us to be reborn and remade. He is not the God of th religion in which the clever people tell us they are interested, b pure outgoing overflowing grace, to which all Christian living is sponse.

Which in turn explains why the very greatest contemplatives, Paul, St John, St Augustine, Pope Gregory, St Bernard, St There St Thomas, St Francis de Sales, and let us add, John Wesley a Newman, why these were men of quite unparalleled activity capable of sustaining and performing the ordinary tasks of Chur government with a tenacity, and efficiency, and charity which little the practical man. The sin of Quietism, of which they w never guilty, is due at root to that worst of confusions, the spiritu hedonism which St Francis de Sales described as "being busied w the contentment which God gives," rather than "being occupi with God who gives the contentment."

It is through the increase of our love, under the action of Go grace-giving love, that God unites Himself to the soul and makes his home. But only if we are faithful. This, on the human side, the only but crucial condition. Mysticism, the clear knowledge God in the face of Jesus his Son, is not for the psychic or the drea or the brilliant necessarily, but for those who respond to God's l with a love that is tender and prudent and strong, total and generc and pure; for "love," said Pope Gregory, "is the engine of the so which lifts it up on high." "And this is the reason why so few att to that sight and knowledge of Himself which God desires to g us all, because they are not prepared to forego those things t conflict with this love." "Oh that it might be perfectly understoo wrote St John of the Cross, "how the soul cannot attain to wisdom and riches of God, save by entering into the thicket of ma kinds of suffering, and by setting thereupon its consolation a desire."

Thus the mystics, and there have been few greater than St Jo of the Cross, are most truly biblical at the most crucial point their teaching. No cross, no joy. No loss, no gain. No death, no l "For narrow is the gate, and straitened the way, that leadeth u life, and few they be that find it." And "if any man would co after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and foll me. For whosoever would save his life shall lose it, and whosoe

ıll lose his life for my sake shall find it." There must be that oliness without which no man shall see the Lord."

Thus, if we are going to see God, even dimly, and enjoy Him in is life, we must be prepared to suffer every kind of trial for His ke, and deny ourselves whatever distracts our affection from Him. hat these trials and self-denials will be will vary with each indidual; but there will be one kind of loss which all of us must suffer namely, the loss of self-will, in every form it takes. This is only ıat we might have expected, since, if the general ruin of the man race was brought about by man's preference of his own will his Maker's, his restoration must necessarily involve the foreing of that will, and submission once more, in the power of grace d his own heart's affection, to the perfect and beneficent will of ɔd, in which his final joy and freedom lie. So that mystical theɔgy, in its widest sense, is the account of the trials which must borne and of the way in which they may be borne, if the ıl is to find God and see God. It is an account of the purifying ect of these trials on the texture of the soul; and finally, it is the st-hand account of the various degrees of knowledge and of joy d of union with God which this purging brings. It is, in fact, a ıg commentary on the two cardinal sayings in the teaching of sus in the Fourth Gospel, that "if any man will do his will, he ıll know of the doctrine, whether it be of God" (vii, 17), and iv, 21, 3), "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my ther, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him. . . . a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love m, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." short, the first-hand knowledge of God and union with God are ıained not by argument about His Nature or proofs of His existce, nor by the dim fleeting experience of His Presence in nature, t through the deliberate committal of the will in practical obedice to His will, through the willingness to descend the abyss of bmission. The answer to those who seek our Lord is always "Come d see," with the emphasis on "come." And this is the reason why gument by unbelievers, even the subtlest, is so futile against knowlge and assurance gained in this way; for only those who try this y of the Cross may see God, in the ground of their being, and ne of those who see may convince those who decline for various ısons to try. They talk to each other across the narrow but bottoms chasm of practical obedience, not of superior intellect, and only e decision to put pride and scruples aside and cross this dark asm can bring a man to the interior knowledge and certainty, not ly of God's reality and power, but of Christ's divinity and good th.

Hence it is that the mystical life, which is the Christian life its perfection, is open to all, and indeed the vocation of every ıristian; hence, too, the fact that so many of the poor and unırned have achieved such sanctity and an illumination of mind at in every age has enabled them to penetrate to the understand-

ing of spiritual secrets altogether hidden from the brilliant unb liever. Knowledge of God, union with God, and joy in God deri from this loving practical obedience and detachment from all that H calls us to forego, and nothing else can take its place. That is why t reading of the mystical writers is so great a help to the living of t spiritual life, for the mystics, the Saints, are those who have travell this road of self-denial to the end and left us their maps of the wa Such self-denial is a point which has been laboured; but there c be no use in talking about union with God unless we first fix in o minds and make sure that we cannot have it, because of our fall state, without paying a heavy price, the price, however, which o Lord has paid already.

But the progressive stages by which we are raised to this uni are another matter, and involve an account of the spiritual life fro the beginning.

JOHN BYROM.

The Gospel in the Old Testament according to Hebrews

THE conception of the O.T. as pointing forward to the New, containing types, symbols, and figures of the New, is of course o of the main principles of the author of the Epistle to the Hebre He speaks of the Mosaic ceremonial as being a shadow of the n dispensation; he sees in Melchisedec and in David figures of Chri But there is also evidence that the author of *Hebrews* believed th he detected in the O.T. more than that. There are parts of the O. where the gospel is actually preached, he maintained, where it not just prefigured or symbolized, but actually set forth. Like Paul, who seems to suggest that Moses knew all about the gosp (2 Cor. iii, 15, 16), the author of *Hebrews* held that the Jews ceived not only shadows and hints of the gospel, but that they cou actually have known the gospel if they had understood what G was saying to them in the O.T. This aspect of the author of *Hebre* thought is one which Westcott, in his otherwise exhaustive Append on O.T. Interpretation in his edition of the Epistle, appears to ov look. We can easily understand the omission; Westcott's great co cern was to vindicate the O.T. in the light of criticism as an essent though incomplete prelude to the New. To have given attention the suggestion that the gospel could actually be learned from t O.T. would unnecessarily have complicated his task. But a compl examination of what the author of *Hebrews* really thought abo the O.T. requires that this aspect also of his teaching be brought light.

There are many quotations from the Psalms in *Hebrews*, and some of them it is plain that the author of the Epistle believes th in these passages either the Father or the Son is speaking direc to us; moreover, what is said in them usually has reference to Incarnation. Thus in *Heb.* i, 5-13 the Father is represented as dressing the Son in Psalms ii, 7; civ, 4; xlv, 6, 7; cii, 25-27; and cx

The Son speaks to the Father in a quotation from xl, 6-8 in *Heb.* x, 5. Westcott contends that all the quotations in *Heb.* i refer to the Second Coming of the Son, not to the Incarnation, saying that you cannot translate *ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτοτόκον εἰς τὸν κόσμον* in *Heb.* i, 6 as "and, moreover, when the Father brings the Firstborn into the world" (*i.e.*, at the Incarnation), because *πάλιν* never means "moreover" but only "again," and *ὅταν εἰσαγάγῃ* must refer to a future time. But the use of *πάλιν* in verse 5 suggests that it requires very little change of meaning to translate *ὅταν δὲ πάλιν* in verse 6 as "and again when . . ."; in the second place *ὅταν εἰσαγάγῃ* was future from the point of view of the Psalmist even if it is taken as referring to the Incarnation. There seems no grammatical objection, therefore, to render: "And, again, when he should bring the Firstborn into the world, he says . . ." And surely the context is strongly in favour of understanding the phrase as referring to the Incarnation. After all, the purpose of all these O.T. extracts in this chapter is to show that Christ *has received* a higher position than the angels. Quotations which refer to the glory He will receive at the Second Coming are not very relevant to this. Again, the quotation from Psalm xlv in *Heb.* i, 8, 9 refers to the Son's being anointed—*i.e.*, being made Christ, which cannot possibly be postponed till the Second Coming. It is true that the quotation from Psalm cx in verse 13 of this chapter must have partial reference to the end of all things, when all the Son's enemies will have been subdued, but the Session at God's right hand, to which, according to the author of *Hebrews*, the Psalm also refers, is a present event and part of the gospel. When, therefore, God brings the Firstborn into the world, at the Incarnation, He says: "Let all the angels of God worship him," and the conception of the angels worshipping the Incarnate, Suffering, and Triumphant Christ is entirely in accord with the rest of the N.T. Compare 1 Peter i, 12 and ii, 5-9 of this Epistle, where Christ is "crowned with glory and honour" on the Cross. Of course "Let all the angels of God worship him" is not a quotation from the Psalms, but from the LXX of Deut. xxxii, 43. But if it can be established that the author of *Hebrews* referred this quotation to the Incarnation, the quotations from the Psalms which follow must be intended in the same sense.

The author of *Hebrews* believes, then, that God speaks specifically about the Incarnation in the Psalms, and, indeed, in other parts of the O.T. also. But in order to do so he has to adopt the most extraordinary canons of interpretation. When he does trace the utterance of the Father or the Son in a Psalm he cannot possibly have held that the same Person was speaking all through the same Psalm—*e.g.*, in *Heb.* i, 8, as we have seen, Psalm cii, 25-27 is quoted as the utterance of the Father to the Son. But verse 24 of this Psalm, "I said, Oh my God, take me not away in the midst of my days," could not possibly be thought of as the Father's utterance. Again in *Heb.* x, 5, Psalm xl, 6-8 is quoted as the utterance of the Son to the Father on the eve of the Incarnation, but verse 12 of this Psalm, with its vehement confession of sin, cannot be attributed to the Son.

It may be suggested that these quotations were gleaned from a catena of O.T. references such as early Christian preachers used, though the very unsuitableness of these quotations for the purpose for which our author uses them makes this unlikely. But even so his using the O.T. in this manner presupposes a canon of interpretation sufficiently far from a belief in the O.T. as nothing more than a partial foreshadowing of the new dispensation, to make us hesitate before we can claim our author's method of O.T. interpretation as one which we can unreservedly accept to-day.

There is one passage in which the author of *Hebrews* seems to teach that Christ spoke through the mouth of a prophet to foretell His Incarnation: this is *Heb.* xii, 25-27. Jesus' blood, he says, *speaks* better things than that of Abel: "See that ye refuse not him that *speaketh*. For if they escaped not that refused him that warned them on earth, much more shall not we escape, who turn away from him that warneth from heaven [better R.V. margin: "him that is from heaven"]; *whose* voice then shook the earth; but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more will I make to tremble not the earth only, but also the heaven." Who is *τὸν ἀπ'οὐράνων*, "him that is from heaven"? It looks like *τὸν λαλοῦντα*, "him that speaketh" in the same verse. But this *τὸν λαλοῦντα* must surely be the same as the implied subject of *λαλοῦντι* in verse 24 (the blood that speaketh)—*i.e.*, Jesus. But in that case "whose voice then shook the earth" in verse 26 must also refer to Jesus (so Westcott), and the author of the Epistle is claiming that the mysterious utterance in Hag. ii, 6 is that of the Son. Hag. ii, 6, 7, with its strange promise "the desirable things of all nations shall come," was interpreted in a Messianic sense in the Vulgate: "veniat desideratus cunctis gentibus." The whole passage reinforces the point of *Heb.* xiii, 18, that we are dealing with a heavenly, spiritual, and eternal dispensation, not an earthly, material, and temporal one, such as concerned them "who refused him that warned them on earth" (*i.e.*, at Sinai). The point, then, of *τὸν ἀπ'οὐράνων ἀποστρεφόμενοι* is that formerly they had to deal with a God of earthly and temporal rewards, now we have to deal with a God who has revealed an eternal redemption, and who has told us of it through Haggai. The significance of the two sets of references, one to the shaking of the earth at the theophany at Sinai, and the other to the shaking of heaven and earth foretold in Haggai, is of course to show that Haggai's was a Messianic prophecy. Christ there spoke of His Incarnation. Note that it must be His Incarnation, not the Second Coming that fulfils this shaking, because it has already been fulfilled. The "kingdom that cannot be shaken" belongs to Christians already. In verse 22 of this passage they "*are come* unto Mount Sion." It is very interesting that our author should attribute to Christ a passage in Haggai which is introduced by the words: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts," and it is reminiscent of the doctrine found in Justin and others that whenever in the O.T. God is specifically described as speaking this is not God the Father, but God the Son. Compare John xii, 41, where apparently Isaiah in the Temple is described as seeing Christ's glory.

Even more interesting is another passage, in which the author of *Hebrews* specifically describes Israel in the wilderness as having been "evangelized." In iv, 1 he has been saying that Israel under Moses was not able to enter into God's rest because of their unbelief. We too, he adds, must beware of falling into similar unbelief and so missing that rest also, "for we also have heard the gospel, even as they"—*ἐσμεν εὐηγγελισμένοι*. A little further on in verse 6 he refers to the same people as "those who had formerly heard the gospel"—*οἱ πρότερον εὐαγγελισθέντες*. R.V. with its translation "we have had good tidings preached unto us [R.V. margin: "a gospel"] even as also they," and Westcott with his "For indeed we *have* received a message of good tidings . . . even as also they," attempts to water this down. But in an N.T. context *εὐηγγελισμένοι* can only mean one thing. Westcott's rendering would understand the argument as saying that Israel had the good tidings of the rest at Canaan which they disbelieved, while we have the good tidings of the eternal rest of the kingdom. But this is exactly what our author is concerned to disprove. On the contrary, he says, the Canaan rest could not have been meant in Psalm xcv, or David, writing so long after the event, would have had no reason to mention it: "For if Joshua had given them rest, he would not have spoken afterward of another day" (*Heb.* iv, 8). In fact the author of the Epistle here maintains that Israel in the wilderness, had they not been faithless, might have known about the coming kingdom.[1]

Finally, in the light of what we have seen about our author's belief that the gospel is actually set forth in the O.T., there are one or two other passages in his Epistle which we must interpret rather differently from the usual view, which would make him understand the O.T. as foreshadowing, rather than explicitly stating, the gospel. In *Heb.* xi, 19 Abraham is described as "in a parable" receiving Isaac back from the dead at the sacrifice on Mount Moriah. On first sight we might conclude that the passage merely stated that the deliverance of Isaac from death was an incident which essentially resembled the rising of Christ from the dead, and hence it might be looked on as a sort of hint of what God was to do in the future. But it seems more likely that our author believed that Abraham actually learned from this incident that God would raise someone from the dead, perhaps even that he learned that God would raise His only begotten Son from the dead (*τὸν μονογενῆ* is used in verse 17). Similarly when Moses is described in xi, 26 as "accounting the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt," it is probably not sufficient explanation to say, as Westcott does, that this is the reproach "that belongs to him who is the appointed envoy of God to a rebellious world . . . the people of Israel was 'an anointed race,' 'a Christ,' even as Christians are 'Christs.'" This is the way in which we to-day would understand it, but it is probable that our

[1] There is one parallel use to Westcott's translation in the N.T., 1 Thess. iii, 6: *Τιμοθέου . . . εὐαγγελισαμένου ἡμῖν τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ὑμῶν*. But even here Milligan comments: "So good was Timothy's news that to the Apostles it was a veritable gospel."

author thought of Moses as knowing that the end of the proces which the Exodus began would be the coming of Christ, and hence reproach gained in initiating this process was the reproach of Chris

When therefore the author of *Hebrews* writes of God speakin "unto the fathers . . . by divers portions and in divers manners," w may not understand him to be propounding a theory of developin revelation in the O.T., much as we should like to. He is saying, i fact, that God set forth the truth about Himself in the O.T. in great variety of ways (*πολυτρόπως*), sometimes telling us one aspect c the truth, sometimes another (*πολυμερῶς*). And we must confess tha when we realize this we can better understand the origin of thos two difficult doctrines which are so prominent in Justin, are cer tainly present in Irenæus, and can even be traced in Tertullian an other early Fathers, the doctrine that the whole gospel could b found set forth in the O.T., and the doctrine that when God i represented as speaking in the O.T. it is often, perhaps always, Go the Son who speaks. Justin was only bringing to a logical conclusio what was implied in the N.T. writers' interpretation of the O.T With the present return to what may justly be called a more biblica theology, we are naturally anxious to understand, and adopt if w can, the methods which the N.T. writers used in interpreting th O.T. But if we are honest I think we must confess that we canno unreservedly do so. The gospel was not set forth in the O.T.—no at any rate, in the way that the author of *Hebrews* thought it was Moses did not in his day understand all about the gospel (our Lord' words in Luke vii, 28 [Matt. xi, 11] should make this clear anyway) God the Son was not addressing God the Father in Psalm cx, 6-8 This is not to deny that with some of the most important principle of O.T. interpretation as seen by N.T. writers we can agree. Bu to imagine that, despite the conclusions of Higher Criticism, w can easily adopt the N.T. attitude towards the O.T. without doin violence to the truth is certainly a mistake.

ANTHONY HANSON.

American Letter: No. 3

THE American educational pattern is perhaps one of the mos complex and least understood areas of our national life. I do no refer only to the visitor from other lands who is usually the firs to admit his confusion—that is, if he does not quite quickly seize upon one or two superficial or isolated aspects of his experience an treat them as definitive for the total problem. Rather, I have in mind general writers on the subject, commentators and essayists administrators and trustees, faculty, and even the students them selves.

It is, then, difficult to generalize about the current attitude an practice of American colleges and universities regarding religion Thus, what follows cannot be held to be a floodlight on the dismal and tangled swampland, but an effort to cast a single beam from a fixed point.

I. There is not only such a multifarious number of educational objectives as to seem to approach anarchy but a veritable kaleidoscope of institutional expressions, that we should anticipate divergent theories and practices regarding the place of religion in colleges and universities. Keeping in mind that more than one "scheme" is often found in a single college, the various situations in the non-Roman institutions can be subsumed under six headings.

(*a*) *The church-related colleges,* usually smaller institutions but not always, *who have a chaplain* as an officer of the college or with the status of a faculty-member. The chaplain may or may not be a clergyman of the same denomination as is associated with the college. His duties usually include conduct and supervision of services in the college chapel, teaching in the "religion department," directing a program of discussion groups and social service activities, and some personal counselling. The college may still maintain a tradition of compulsory attendance at chapel. In many cases "chapel" is but little more than a required general assembly during which are read notices in regard to visiting lecturers, athletic and social events, changes in the academic schedules, etc.

(*b*) *Some larger private colleges and universities* having historic connexions with a religious group may have an *official chaplain or religious counsellor.* Such individuals may have as a staff either ministers or women workers representing the dominant religious groups on the campus. The staff members are usually supported financially by the denominations which they represent; they may have only a co-operative relationship to the chaplain or, in some cases, work more or less under his supervision. At colleges of the type indicated here there is usually an undergraduate department of religion in which are offered a variety of courses for academic credit. Attendance at chapel, if there be one, is not usually required.

(*c*) The third type of situation, found mostly in *tax-supported institutions,* is where there is no official provision nor recognition of religion. In a few isolated instances there may be courses offered "in religion." Such may be taught by members of the faculty or nearby clergymen who are regarded as qualified for such work.

(*d*) Another variation found in some colleges and universities is that in which there is *no department of religion, formally organized, but under other departments courses may be offered which present certain information about religion or religions.* The Literature Department may have a course or two on the Bible; the History Department may have courses in the Comparative Study of Religion; under the Philosophy Department there may be offered one or more courses in the Philosophy of Religion; and the Psychology of Religion will be the responsibility of the Department of Psychology.

(*e*) A large number of institutions may have located on their campuses student *branches of the Y.M.C.A and the Y.W.C.A. or both.* Occasionally these have a quasi-official standing. Although the student divisions of the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. are accustomed to refer to themselves as the Student Christian Movement, they have little resemblance to the S.C.M. in England—a situation which has

created no end of confusion for visitors from the British S.C.M. I the first place the S.C.M. in this country is not an autonomou *student* movement, being always subject in the long run to th policies of the parent organizations. Nor is it a "movement" but a overhead organization set up regionally and nationally in which th *local campus groups* are enlisted; that is, there is no such thing a *individual* membership in the S.C.M. Perhaps the most strikin difference between the British and American S.C.M. is that in th latter case there is but little church or denominational participatio or support. Representation of the churches is through individua and not officially. In fact, the policy of the student Y.M.C.A. an Y.W.C.A. is not *inter-denominational* but *non-denominational*, an in some cases is anti-church or anti-denominational. Which is to sa that on more than one campus the student Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A is in effect another denomination working in competition with othe denominational or church groups.

The history and policy of the student Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A being what they are, it is not surprising that such groups do nc evidence much theological or devotional interest. Their activitie are mainly expressions of a social, ethical, and political concern.

It would be a mistake to minimize the contributions of these tw groups in keeping alive among college students during the latte part of the nineteenth century and the first two decades of th twentieth century some residue of religious interest and, more pa ticularly, of missionary zeal. They were aware of the need for r ligious work among students long before the churches and othe religious groups, and were able to achieve much during the for years in the wilderness when the colleges, many of which were Chri tian in foundation and in name, did so very little if anything.[1]

(*f*) Since the beginning of this century *the various religious grou* (Roman, Anglican, Protestant, Jewish) *have felt an increasing r sponsibility for the religious life of their college and universi students.* The effort to make possible continuing religious care members of their own group has led to numerous and varied a proaches by local churches and synagogues, by regional, synodica or diocesan agencies, and by the national boards of ecclesiastical i stitutions.

At the present time religious work among students is carried c by the churches, etc., in one of three ways. By far the largest numb of students are ministered to by a nearby pastor who is in char of a local congregation. He may be assisted by a curate or a woma

[1] As has been pointed out more than once, the dropping for many years courses in religion, chaplains, and other provisions for the religious life students, even by colleges of church foundation, was due to two factors. Fi and foremost there was the widespread suspicion that an historical, critical, a "scientific" approach to matters of religion was unchristian; accordingly t colleges could not or would not risk the disapproval of the parents and t public-at-large. They followed the more cautious path of doing nothin Secondly, there was in many quarters unlimited confidence that science w about to solve or dissolve all the problems of man, ethical and religious. So w clutter up the academic landscape with the ruins and rubble of a bygone age?

religious worker (in the case of a woman's college or co-educational school). In some situations there is a specially appointed clergyman, supported by funds outside of the "parish," who is nominally attached to the staff of the local church but acts as chaplain for the students of his denomination and in most cases giving full time to that particular cure.

A second method of denominational work is through a clergyman or woman worker based, as it were, on a non-parochial "student centre" and chapel *situated near* the college. In some communities the student registration is so high that local churches could not absorb the huge numbers of students into the regular parish life. Even if such were possible, the local church, its organization and work, does not readily lend itself to maximum participation by students. There is little opportunity afforded for the development of *student* leadership nor fully to meet the intellectual, moral, and religious needs of the students as a group. The disadvantage of a special "student centre" is that there is a certain artificiality about worshipping and working together exclusively with people of one's own age. Much is missed by the young people in being isolated from the normal parish life and the whole community of infants, children, business and professional men, mechanics and farmers, housewives, and old people. This difficulty is obviated in some degree if the chapel and centre have a permanent constituency of faculty members and their families.

The third approach, not so frequently found, is where the work of the churches is done by their representatives from an office, building, or chapel which is *located on* campus and more or less officially sponsored by the college. Here the work is from *within* the college community and seems more immediately effective than where the base of operations is "off-campus." However, this particular solution to the problem of ministering to college students shares with the second type, as above, the weakness of discontinuity with the main stream of church life and of the somewhat exotic flavour of merely school or college religion.

* * * * *

II. Up to this point, I have refrained intentionally from any discussion of the policy and practice of the Episcopal Church in the area of religious work in colleges and universities. By way of introduction to the peculiar situation of the Episcopal Church, certain points should be made.

First, the Episcopal Church has the highest proportion of students of any religious group in the colleges and universities. The same is true of members of the teaching staffs of higher education institutions. In the country as a whole one out of *ninety-five* persons is an Episcopalian, but in the colleges one out of *twenty* is a member of the Episcopal Church, four and a half times as many Episcopalians, proportionately, in colleges as in the country. Hence the ambiguous slogan, "Episcopalians are denser in the colleges."

This means that a high concentration of the young people of the

Episcopal Church is to be found in specific communities across the land. It is readily seen, then, that the religious opportunities made available to college students are of the utmost importance to us. We have a larger stake in the game than any other religious group.

Secondly, the distribution of Episcopalian students is not uniform. With only four or five colleges having even the slightest official connexion with the Episcopal Church it should not be expected that many Episcopalians would be enrolled in "church colleges." In some instances the proportion of Episcopalians in a "church college" does not exceed the proportion in many non-Church-related colleges. In fact there are a number of the larger universities which have far more Episcopalians enrolled than in any one "church college," and in a few universities there are more Episcopalians enrolled than in all the church colleges combined.

The Episcopalians are concentrated in the older colleges and universities of the East, in the large middle-western and southern state colleges and universities, and the larger institutions of the west coast. There are fewer in number, and proportionately, in agricultural schools or colleges, in "normal" or teachers' colleges, and in schools located between the Rocky Mountain area and the Pacific Coast region. All this reflects the predominantly urban character of the Episcopal Church and the general economic and social status of its membership.

Thirdly, although many of the Protestant denominations were and are content to leave the responsibility for the religious care of their young people to the colleges themselves or the student branches of the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A., because of the very nature of the Episcopal Church such cannot be its policy. There has been a special compulsion for the Episcopalian Church to make available its Sacraments and its teaching to its members wherever they may be located. This has created some difficulties because, although most colleges have readily recognized the propriety of a special concern and approach by the Roman Catholics and the Jews, they have not easily seen any reason for treating Episcopalian students other than as members of a minority Protestant group. In fairness it should be said that this situation has shown marked improvement in recent years.

Closely related to this problem has been a general lack of willingness on the part of clergy and other official representatives of the Episcopal Church to co-operate *as much as possible* with the colleges' general religious program, where they existed, or with other non-Roman religious groups working in a given college. This has been a source of irritation for college administrators and has, in some instances, undermined the possibility of a co-ordinated and joint approach by all non-Roman Christian groups—a situation to be deplored and one for which the Episcopal Church has not been sufficiently penitent.

The development of the work of the Episcopal Church in the college situation has gone through four stages which parallel in some degree the pattern of other religious groups. In the early par

of this century the main approach to the problem was the building and maintenance of student dormitories. Apparently, it was believed that such a method would be effective because at many colleges and universities there was not sufficient rooming space available, due to their rapid growth. And by housing Episcopalians and other interested students it would be possible, at least indirectly, to influence the religious and moral attitudes of the residential group. This emphasis did not last long because in time the colleges built their own palatial housing units which made the student residences of the religious groups look exceedingly shabby. At the same time the college dormitories offered a somewhat less rigid control of the private lives of its members. Students moved out in large numbers, the church-sponsored dormitories became an intolerable financial burden, and except in a few cases all were eventually abandoned. This was actually no great loss, except financially, because it had long been realized by the various churches that that particular approach was not meeting the situation.

The next phase was the establishment of "student centres," the primary purpose of such being to provide social and recreational facilities which were for the most part lacking on college campuses except to the privileged few who were members of social fraternities, clubs, etc. The idea was, and still carries over in some places, that by bringing students together in church-sponsored centres it would be possible to interest them in a more specifically religious way. As might be expected, even at its best, this did not work too well and tended to attract only the "problem children" of the college; not that these also do not need the ministry of the Church, but that there was an undesirable homogeneity about such groups which tended to repel the better balanced and more outstanding students. At any rate, it was not long before the colleges themselves began to provide an extensive program of social activities and to build the luxurious club-like "unions" or centres replete with dining-rooms, rathskellars, dance-halls, billiard tables, bowling alleys, reading-rooms, music-rooms, etc., etc.—and "no strings (religious or otherwise) attached."

As time went on, two things became increasingly evident: that the financial support of work among college students cannot be placed solely on the local church or even the diocese; and that the church's function in college communities should be what it is everywhere—the ministry of the Word and Sacraments. To meet the former need there came into existence a special department of the National Council of the Episcopal Church, and similar arrangements in the national boards of other religious groups, the functions of which were to develop a national policy and program for religious work among Episcopalian students and to assist financially the employment of qualified "chaplains" and women religious workers.[1] The latter stated need has been met by a strong movement

[1] This program has received invaluable assistance from the Church Society for College Work, an auxiliary association of bishops and other clergy, educators, and lay-people in general.

to centre the church's work in a chapel or in other ways to provi for the worship, instruction, and pastoral care of student memb of the Episcopal Church. Although the growth of this approach h been slow it has been increasingly successful. This also we shou have anticipated.

Concomitant with these two developments has been the growi conviction that the key to effective religious work on the campus the enlistment of the very best men and women in the churc college ministry. Many have responded to the call; and it is int esting to note that to-day some of the outstanding bishops and oth clergy served their apprenticeship as college pastors.

The present stage of development in more recent years has be a growing recognition of the fact that despite the evident success the Church in meeting the religious needs of individual studer the solution to the fundamental problem must be in terms of radical reorientation of the whole academic community. The clima of opinion within which students live, and move, and have th being is completely secular. The work of the Episcopal Church date has been a sniping action—picking off students one by one saving individuals out of their world and not the conversion of t world. The guerilla campaign hitherto waged must become to war. Accordingly the swing is toward a ministry to the total colle community including faculty as well as students.[1]

Moreover, it must be admitted that to date very little has be accomplished with graduate students, members of the professio schools of law and medicine, and the "commuting" students (as plained above) who, it is assumed, are members of their ho parish although in fact they have little to do with it.

The Episcopal Church in this country has been a pioneer in t development of a successful approach, as far as it goes, in the cla fication of objectives, and in the laying down of a long-range poli Its work in some college communities has been notable.

III. No one can claim an unqualified success for the religio work in the colleges and universities carried on by any church denomination. This is partly due to factors that are inherent in t nature of our schools, colleges, and universities. The basic difficu can be seen best, perhaps, by an analogy.

The average college in the U.S.A. is in effect a rival church. down in the midst of a particular civic community, it is a self-c tained, coherent and tightly organized community itself—an *perium in imperio*. It meets, or purports to meet, every need physical, intellectual, moral, and spiritual—of its members. It has own life and concerns which rarely impinge on its surrounding co munity and even more rarely are affected by its immediate soc context.

As in the case of any church it has its own dogma—*i.e.*, a gen ally accepted view of ultimate reality, of man and his destiny, a the relation between the two. It has its own ethic, not to be fou

[1] Various organized groups of lay-people who are members of college facul have come recently into existence to assist in this effort.

merely in its disciplinary rules, etc., but in its view of what constitutes acceptable behaviour and the motive for the same. And the college has its cult expressions in academic exercises and processions; football rallies, initiation ceremonies for entering students; architectural symbols such as the athletic stadium and the science and engineering buildings (in many cases reducing to insignificance the chapel, if any, and the library); the cheer-leaders, college songs, yells, etc.; and the "religious habit" in the form, just now, of baggy trousers, or "slacks," the sweater or varicoloured jacket, and dirty shoes—for both men and women alike.

The nearby Christian church is a church of the civic community and not of the academic community. And although the church of the civic community may be geographically just across the street it is psychologically miles away. Accordingly the effort of the Christian church is actually the endeavour to proselytize from one faith to another; and nothing can be harder than that.

To change the analogy, the college community is a high-walled city and cannot be captured by direct and frontal assault. It is vulnerable only to a Christian fifth column. This is the strategy of the Church to-day.

ALDEN DREW KELLEY.

The Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass in the Swedish Church

A VERY common symbol in Christian liturgy is that of the Lamb of God pouring out its blood into a chalice, or, sometimes, the crucified Lord with two or three angels holding chalices gathering up the precious Blood from His hands and feet. This symbol or picture represents in a very significant way the identity of the Sacrifice of the Cross and the Sacrifice of the Mass. It is the same *materia* in both cases. The word "sacrifice" can be used in two ways: First, meaning something which is offered; the collection of alms in the Mass could be called a sacrifice, and the sacrifice is placed on the altar; it is a sacrifice of so many shillings. Secondly, the word sacrifice can mean the action by which something is offered. The act of collecting the alms, placing the almsbags on the plate, the plate and the bags then being lifted up and placed on the altar could also be rightly called a sacrifice. But here it is not the *materia* but the *actus*. And we have no symbol indicating that the Sacrifice of Golgotha should be the same *actus* as the Sacrifice of the Mass.

The Swedish Church has a very clear doctrine of the Real Presence, as is well known to all theologians who know the doctrine of the Swedish Church. But that we also have a very explicit doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass is not very well known.

The principal *locus* is to be found in the Swedish Church Order, a confessional document, where it is said (pp. 14-15) that the Sacrifice of our Lord, the heavenly High Priest on Golgotha, is present in the Mass. It goes on to say that some people teach that

the word *Missa* means Sacrifice, and that therefore we should no call the holy Eucharist *Missa*. But, the Church Order continues, th word *Missa* (Swedish Mässa) does not mean Sacrifice, but even if i did we could still use it as a name for the holy Eucharist, becaus "it is not prohibited to call this Sacrament a Sacrifice, as it ha always been called in Christendom, since the Sacrifice, which wa offered by Christ our High Priest once on the Cross, is performed i the Mass." ("Sa år det heller icke förbjudet kalla detta Sakramen offer, såsom alltid har skett i kristenheten, eftersom det offer, som vår Överstepräst Kristus en gång gjorde på korset, varder i Mässan förhandlat.") Perhaps the verb "förhandla" is better translated b "deal with," as "perform" seems to refer to action, but "deal with" more to a *materia*, which is "dealt with." "Perform" could includ repetition, which is not included in the sense of dealing with a action already consummated. And what is said is this: that the sam *materia, hoc est* the Body and Blood of Christ, is offered in the Mas and on the Cross; there is only one Sacrifice as far as the *materia* i concerned. But there are two different Sacrifices when we consider the *actus*.

The Church Order was written by the first post-Reformation Archbishop of Uppsala and accepted as a confessional document o the Swedish Church in 1571. The same Archbishop, *Laurentius Petri*, has in his *Dialogus* written some sentences which could b used as a commentary on the passages quoted from the Church Order. He says (p. 119): "You may call the Sacrament a Sacrifice because it signifies or represents that Sacrifice which Christ offered on the Cross." And (p. 139): "The old Fathers call the Sacrament a Sacrifice because the Priest and the congregation hold it between the wrath of God and their sins as a sign of peace." These two passages show that the Mass was considered to be the same thing as the Sacrifice on the Cross. It is in some way conciliatory; it is a sign of peace. In the Mass the Sacrament—*i.e.*, the Body and Blood of Christ—is lifted up to God between His wrath and our sins.

The third instance we would examine is David Hollazius, typical representative of sixteenth-century theology. In his *Examen theologicum accroamaticum* we find some very instructive sentences (*Part* II., *Sect.* II., *Cap.* V., *Qu.* 21, *Obs.* III.). The writer analyses the question of the Sacrifice of the Mass from many points of view and then sums up: *"Distinguendum est inter sacrificium materialiter et formaliter sumptum. Si materialiter sumamus, Eucharistia idem numero sacrificium est, quod fuit in cruce, sive res et substantia prorsus eadem, eadem inquam victima sive hostia. Si vero sacrificium accipiamus formaliter, sive pro actu sacrificiandi, tum etsiamsi sit victima una et eadem numero, non tamen eadem actio, sive immolatio est, quæ sit in Eucharistia cum immolatione, quæ in cruce peracta fuit."* Hollazius is a German theologian of the post-Reformation period, but his words could very well be used as a commentary on the sentences in the Swedish Church Order, because they accurately describe the doctrine of the Swedish Church concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass. This doctrine can be summed up as follows:

The Sacrifice of Christ is present and is dealt with in the Mass; there is the same substance in the Mass and on the Cross—*i.e.*, the Body and Blood of our Lord.

It is offered as a propitiation on the Cross and in the Mass held between the wrath of God and our sins as a sign of peace (reconciliation).

The action of Sacrifice (*actio sacrificandi*) is not the same on the Cross and in the Mass, for the Sacrifice on the Cross was unique, made only once for all, wherefore the Mass is not a repetition of the Sacrifice of the Cross, but a representation or signification of it.

The identity of the Sacrifice on the Cross and the Sacrifice of the Mass is an identity of substance but not of action.

GUNNAR ROSENDAL.

Tract Cases

THE clergy are often urged to make more use of tract cases in order to spread the faith by the printed page. Some notes by one who has had experience over many years both as producer of pamphlet literature and in managing bookstalls may be useful.

The results of stalls held at conferences, where a large number of visitors attend, who are interested in the subject but have no knowledge of what pamphlet literature is available, are no guide to what can be done in an ordinary church. There the starting of a stall generally means a modest rush at first followed by stagnation. The stock moves very slowly and soon gets dirty. Regular churchgoers do not look at the stall because there is never anything new and the manager dares not add to his losses by purchasing new stock when so much remains unsold. There are few visitors, unless the church is in a holiday resort or of historic interest, so he must rely on the ordinary congregation. They listen to the vicar's sermons and probably feel that they already get as much dogmatic instruction as they want.

Nevertheless, something can be done if only the vicar will co-operate energetically with the stallkeeper. He can mention pamphlets in his sermons, especially in connexion with Lent and other seasons of the Church, and encourage the stallkeeper by making him literature secretary for the parish, so that literature for confirmation candidates, missionary meetings, and children's work is ordered through him.

In a large centre like a cathedral the problem is different, for you have a stream of visitors of all denominations or none, and in effect a new public every day, especially in the summer months. In the last four years at Chichester Cathedral I have been in charge of the tract case. The turnover is between £300 and £400 a year, and the total of items sold yearly more than 30,000. This is exclusive of literature and postcards connected with the Cathedral, which are kept separate and the sale of which naturally far exceeds that of the tracts. The profit is a little over 10 per cent., in spite of the discounts allowed by publishers, which are generally 2d. to 3d. in the shilling. There is a considerable wastage from handling and a serious amount of underpaying. Judging from the amount of conscience money received, sometimes months later, many good people take literature

meaning to send the money later and forget to do so. If matter attractive to the general public is stocked, some stealing by children is inevitable. But on the whole the losses are negligible compared with what the cost of paid supervision would be. The stall is wholly unattended, and the vergers can only occasionally give an eye to it. These are some of the points that strike me.

1. Nearly half the items sold are pictures and cards. Probably religious mottoes and sacred pictures do as much good as pamphlets; to some classes of people they are the only avenue of approach.

2. The sale of literature on Christian doctrine is negligible. The explanation probably is that those who might be expected to profit by the many admirable pamphlets that exist prefer books to pamphlets. On principle I do not stock books—first, because they are nearly always net and no discount is obtainable on them; secondly, in order to avoid any possible offence on the part of bookshops.

3. The great majority of purchases are made in order to give away. Many visitors never enter a religious bookshop and are surprised to find what is available. They buy for their day or Sunday school children or to send to friends.

4. Illustrations and coloured wrappers increase sales greatly. The pamphlets put out by Church societies and groups in large format without a cover are generally unsaleable. Generally speaking the smaller the size the better the chance of sale—a man can put a small pamphlet in his pocket, a lady in her handbag.

5. The rapid rise of prices has affected sales. Of a 3d. pamphlet on the Roman controversy I used to sell 200 a year. It went out of print and was taken over by another publisher, who raised the price to 1s. 6d., with the result that the sale in my hands fell to about twenty a year.

6. When no change can be given it is necessary to avoid stocking things with fancy prices like 8d. or 10d. A publisher who raises a 6d. article to 8d. kills his market. He ought to reduce the size or embellishments and keep to 6d. or else double the price and make it look better.

7. No tract case in a busy centre can be run without unremitting labour. Tidying the stall in the summer months, moving into their right compartments all displaced articles, rubbing off finger marks and straightening crumpled pages, and looking out and arranging new stock can hardly take less than one hour a day.

The question arises, is the result worthy of the toil, especially as so few things are sold that positively teach the faith? You cannot answer yes with sure conviction, but that applies to so many of the things we do in our church life. So I urge others to try, but only if conditions are favourable and someone is prepared to give patient attention to details.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. J. K. Byrom is assistant curate of St Matthew's, Stockport.

The Rev. Anthony Hanson is a Lecturer at the Divinity School, Dornakal, S. India.

Dr Kelley is Dean of Seabury-Western Seminary, Evanston, Illinois.

Dr Rosendal is Rector of St Petri in Osby, Sweden.

Dr Lowther Clarke is a Canon of Chichester Cathedral.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE MINISTRY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Dr Sykes asks for citations from the *Determinationes Theologicæ* which are printed in Volume I of Pearson's *Minor Theological Works*, edited by E. Churton in 1844. It is not easy to summarize the argument of these concentrated discourses, but perhaps the following extracts will show that the author regarded bishops standing in the apostolic succession as necessary for the constitution of a church.

P. 273. Adeoque recte observavit S. Cyprianus, "Ecclesiam esse plebem suo sacerdoti adunatam, et gregem suo pastori adhærentem." Adeo Ecclesia non est sine sacro ordine. Hoc primum.

II. Secundo, ORDINEM SACRUM NON ESSE UNICUM.

Hoc est, Non omnes qui habent spiritualem facultatem ad munia ecclesiastica peragenda, habere facultatem ad omnia munia, sed quemadmodum munia sunt diversa, ita et potestates esse diversas.

P. 278. IV. Quarto, ORDINEM EPISCOPALEM, QUA TALEM, SEU QUATENUS AB ALIIS SACRIS ORDINIBUS DISTINGUITUR, ESSE APOSTOLICUM.

P. 284. Episcopatus fuit in Apostolis a Christo institutus, in successoribus Apostolorum, ab Apostolis derivatus.

P. 287. ORDINANDI POTESTAS SOLIS COMPETIT EPISCOPIS.

Yours sincerely,
ERIC KEMP.

EXETER COLLEGE,
OXFORD.
April 19, 1949.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

The letter addressed to me through your columns by Dr Dix compels me to make further trespass on your space in order to acknowledge his kindness and to offer some observations on his remarks. I wish, however, that he had not introduced the matter of motives. (I refer to the sentence in his letter: "*Whatever his motives,* it is encouraging to find the Dixie professor," etc.) I consider it proper to a correspondence between clergymen on the interpretation of historical evidence that each party should accept *ex animo* the

good faith and integrity of the other. I do this in regard to Dr Dix. I regret that he is doubtful of it in respect of myself.

Perhaps Dr Dix will allow me to wander beyond the limits of his letter and to begin by asking a question arising from his speech in the Lower House of Canterbury Convocation on January 13 last. In *The Chronicle of Convocation* (II—9, 1949, January, No. 1, p. 24) Dr Dix is reported to have said that "his recollection was that Bishop Cosin, on account of what he did at Charenton, was suspended *ab officio* from his service of the Prince of Wales' chapel in Paris." Suspension *ab officio* being a judicial sentence, I wish to ask Dr Dix for (*a*) the dates of the inflicting and the raising of this sentence; (*b*) the name and ecclesiastical status of the authority passing the sentence, and (*c*) the reference to the appropriate authorities dealing with the episode. Obviously the event is too important to rest on recollection.

To turn to Dr Dix's letter, there is of course no dispute that the opinions of Anglican divines in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries differed on the question of recognition of the foreign Reformed churches. I hold that the greater weight of names was on the side of Hooker, Andrews, Bramhall, Cosin, and Wake, to name but some of the leading divines; Dr Dix holds that this was not the case. In his letter he cites the statement of the Prussian ambassador in 1710 that "la pluspart du clergé ici" was in favour of the more rigid view of episcopacy. Wake affirmed to the Antistes of Zurich that his view was supported by *omnes saniores ecclesiæ nostræ symmystæ*; and in a letter to Jean LeClerc of Amsterdam he stated that his standpoint was not shared by *quibusdam furiosis inter nos scriptoribus*. Dr Dix prefers to rely on the judgment of the Prussian ambassador. I consider the primate more likely to have been well informed.

With regard to the works of Wheatly and Comber, once again I shall be grateful to Dr Dix if he will give me the means of following up his statement that "they were both generally used in the professional training of all the eighteenth-century clergy," by giving the evidences and the authorities in which this evidence is contained, on which he bases his assertion. So far as concerns the attitude of Comber, it seems to me generally to agree with that of the divines whose opinions I quoted in my pamphlet. They, too, excused the lack of episcopacy in the foreign Reformed churches on the ground of historical necessity; and they based their hopes of union on the acceptance by those churches of episcopacy as the method of government in the church since apostolic times and on their readiness to receive it into their churches. In the matter of the reception of foreign Protestants to communion with the Church of England, Dr Dix will be aware that in the debates in both houses of parliament on the bill to naturalize foreign Protestants in 1709, it was contended by the whig lowchurchmen that they should be allowed to communicate with any Protestant church in Great Britain, whilst the tory highchurchmen supported an amendment requiring them to communicate only with the Church of England.

I am obliged to Mr Kemp for his references to Bishop Pearson

(and to Dr Dix for his promise of an edition from his own hand with translation). It would not be difficult to parallel Pearson's points from the writings of some of the divines cited in my pamphlet, who nevertheless allowed of exceptions in the case of the foreign Reformed churches. If Pearson explicitly discussed their case and disallowed it, either Mr Kemp or Dr Dix will tell us. If not, the argument from his works has the weakness as well as the strength of an argument from silence.

It is perhaps an unexpected byproduct of this correspondence that Hooker, Whitgift, Andrewes, Bramhall, Thorndike, Taylor, Cosin, Sharp, Ussher, and Wake all find their writings by implication excluded from Dr Dix's category of "publications of contemporary scholars" and of "standard works of the time"; into which select company only Pearson, Wheatly, and Comber at present are specifically admitted. It is difficult to be clear on what grounds those of them who were prelates are dismissed with such descriptions as "court-bishops of the Tudors and Stuarts," whilst Pearson eludes this classification.

It is of course agreed between Dr Dix and myself that the ground of the Anglican position lies in the appeal to the Scriptures and the primitive Church. This appeal was made by the divines on whose writings I relied in my essay towards an historical interpretation of the Anglican attitude towards foreign Protestant churches in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. To determine the question whether their interpretation of the position of the Church of England in regard to the foreign churches was in accordance with this standard would involve of course not a letter but a study of considerable proportions. When Dr Dix produces his promised survey of "some judicious Hanoverian divines," may I express the hope that he will have time to deal also with the question of the employment by S.P.C.K. of German-Danish Lutheran missionaries in India, which is part of the evidence for the Anglican attitude towards non-episcopal ministries?

Yours sincerely,
NORMAN SYKES.

June 1, 1949.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I have read with great interest Dr Mascall's letter which points out that in his opinion the "fundamental line of division in the contemporary discussions about the ministry . . . is between those who look upon the Church . . . as being simply the Church militant here on earth and those who look upon it as consisting of all those who have been baptized into Christ . . ." I am quite in agreement with Dr Mascall's point, although I also think that the main stress in my own essay—that there is a sharp cleavage between those who accept and those who do not accept the ministry as having "ontological status" only because it is "functional to the Church"—is of extraordinary importance, almost of primary im-

portance, in bringing about that understanding which must precede reunion. For certainly one of the major obstacles to such understanding is the conviction of our "separated brethren" that defenders of the apostolic ministry really believe that the ministry is not functional but (so to say) "feeds Catholicity into the Church."

In my Bohlen Lectures, published under the title *His Body the Church* (Morehouse-Gorham, New York, 1945), I made precisely the point upon which Dr Mascall insists. I protested and still protest against Canon Quick's notion that all orders "are to some degree invalid." Yet I believe that our *first* step towards understanding of the meaning of the ministry, as Catholic Christianity sees it, is to make quite clear that it is only in the context of the Church as the Body of Christ, and as working for the Church (which is to say, for Christ through His Spirit in His Body) in this fashion, does the historic ministry possess that authentication and give that surety of commission for which we must contend.

Yours sincerely,
W. Norman Pittenger.

The General Theological Seminary,
New York City, U.S.A.
May 13, 1949.

THE FIRST WORD FROM THE CROSS

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Mr Blair states evidence in favour of the authenticity of Luke xxiii, 34*a*. I would agree that my note has no point except for those who, on the evidence, doubt that authenticity.

I further agree, of course, that "he was not saying, 'It's quite all right really.'" My illustration was intended to bring out the one point that "the ordinary Christian knows that, if anyone hurts him without knowing what he has done, he is generally closer to the mind of Christ if he does not express his forgiveness."

My interpretation does assume that the primary historical reference is to the soldiers who were at the time nailing Him to the cross but it by no means rules out the cosmic and mystical references which Mr Blair suggests, and which I would accept.

Yours sincerely,
A. H. Dammers.

39, Bolton Road,
Anderton, Chorley.
June 1, 1949.

BOOK REVIEWS

A Rebirth of Images. The Making of St John's Apocalypse. By Austin Farrer. Dacre Press. 25s.

Under the somewhat enigmatic title *A Rebirth of Images*, Dr Austin Farrer has undertaken a very remarkable inquiry into the

symbolism of the Johannine Apocalypse, and it is safe to say, in the light of his researches into the interior structure of the book, that the Apocalypse can no longer be looked at as an amalgam of heterogeneous materials pieced together from previous "sources," nor can even the Letters to the Seven Churches be detached from the rest of the work. Dr Farrer, with an extraordinary flair for imagery and symbol ranging from the underworld to the astral heavens, and from the creation-week to the last "It is done!" has elicited from the Apocalypse the evidence of a complex pattern of images—all reborn into Christ, as he says—which indisputably proves the unity of the book and reveals it as a poem, "the one great poem which the first Christian age produced."

The Apocalyptist—who is for Dr Farrer "St John," the author of the Fourth Gospel, but not the son of Zebedee—had of course his learned background, embracing Ezekiel, Zechariah, Daniel, and the Old Testament generally, Rabbinical Judaism, the Jewish sacred calendar with its sequences of feasts and lessons, astralism, and Rabbinical gnosis. On all of these the Apocalyptist has drawn for the intricate "diagram" of sacred history according to which he sees the last things of Christian time unfolding to their consummation. The main point, however, is that the images are selected and the diagram wrought out by and within a mind for which all materials are plastic and subordinated to a unitary conception.

Dr Farrer dissects the Apocalypse into six sets of seven visions: seven Letters, seven Unsealings, seven Trumpets, seven Beast-Visions, seven Vials, and seven Last Things. As in each set the last or seventh element marks a Sabbath or sabbatical pause, the scheme of a week is indicated in each case, and this, by the interior evidence of the third, fourth, and fifth sets, is found to answer to the six workdays of Creation *plus* the Sabbath of God. Furthermore, by reference to the dominant single motive governing the imagery of each in turn of the groups of visions, a higher layer or stratum of symbolism can be made out which reveals the whole series as a great week of days corresponding to the successive acts of Creation. Thus the first seven (the messages to the Churches) connect Christ with the precosmic light of the first creation-day. The second seven (the Unsealings) introduce the firmament of heaven, which was the work of the second day. The third seven (the Trumpets) bring in as instruments of judgment the elements formed on the third and succeeding days of Creation, and so forth. From this analysis—which Dr Farrer pursues with relentless thoroughness—it results that the Apocalypse *in toto* represents a great Week of Days *plus* a final Sabbath-eve (chapter xxi f.), and these both individually and as a group take into their structure the rhythm of the Genesis-acts of God.

In fact, the work of Judgment which accomplishes the world is a week of divine labours. "In six days God made the world, in six He is to fulfil it." The process begins with the Resurrection of Christ towards the close of the fifth historical age of the world (Daniel) and leads to the Millennium, which is the sixth age, and so to the final Sabbath of the New Heaven and the New Earth.

This, however, is but the beginning of Dr Farrer's decoding of the mystery of the Apocalypse. We return to the six series of seven visions, and we observe that, while together they constitute an eschatological "week" as aforesaid, they also conform to the pattern of six quarters of the sun's annual period *plus* again a sabbatical last completion in the World to Come. Individually they connect with the festivals and liturgies of the successive divisions of the Jewish sacred year. Thus the initial manifestation of the Son of Man among the candlesticks symbolically indicates the Feast of Dedication at the winter solstice. The seven Messages to the Churches are governed by the symbolism of the quarter from Dedication to Passover. The seven Unsealings take us by Passover (the Lamb) and Pentecost to midsummer, the seven Trumpets herald the Festival of the New Year, the seven Beast-Visions lead us by Tabernacles to Dedication again. Finally, the two series of the Vials and the Last Things retrace the ground from midwinter by Passover to the summer solstice. And as the four quarters of the year have their counterparts in the four quarters of the stellar heavens, the corresponding signs of the Zodiac, such as Aries, Gemini, and Virgo, are drawn into the symbolism, and St John's great liturgy of fulfilment-history ends in bringing earth and heaven into a single picture.

It is not possible in a short review to pursue to its final reaches the imposing structure of Dr Farrer's analysis, the intricate involutions of pattern derived from the signs of the Zodiac, the tribes of Israel, the jewels on Aaron's breastplate, and the foundations and gates of the Heavenly Jerusalem, which occupy the mind in the closing chapters of the book. At not a few points the Apocalyptist apparently departs from the strict order or form of his pattern, but Dr Farrer is always prompt on such occasions to offer reasons for these deviations. Too prompt, we may find ouselves saying. For, while unity of design is there, it is possible to over-insist on the consistency of the execution, and intuitions have their dangers. The man who sees faces in the fire brings his own qualities of æsthetic, picture-building intuition to the interpretation of what he sees. And Dr Farrer's fertility of mind and inexhaustible fund of Biblical knowledge may lead him at points to divinations of pattern in the Revelation which were not perhaps explicit to the mind of the writer. But this criticism ought not to be pushed too far. It is difficult to think of liturgy as subordinating history to its pattern so completely as Dr Farrer would have us to believe. There remains an amazing verisimilitude in Dr Farrer's intuitions taken as a whole. His book is a remarkable *tour de force*, calling for very serious study. Whether or not we can follow his demonstrations to the last syllable, he has exposed certain great lines along which the general symbolic plan of the Apocalypse is arranged, and he has done it with an insight not perhaps equalled and a thoroughness certainly not surpassed since the Apocalypse was written.

W. Manson.

Edinburgh.

TERTULLIAN'S TREATISE AGAINST PRAXEAS. The Text, edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary, by Ernest Evans. S.P.C.K. 21s.

For the early history of the doctrine of the Trinity in Latin theology there is perhaps no work as important as Tertullian's *Adversus Praxean*. It is here that we meet the word *trinitas* for the first time, and from here onwards the terminology of *una substantia* and *tres personæ* is fixed. Canon Evans has put students of Tertullian in his debt by this useful edition.

It may be said at once that the book is not easy to use. Although the lines of the text are numbered no references are given to them in the commentary, so that time is wasted in finding the place. The text and translation are not printed opposite to one another, which would have been an advantage, since while it may be possible to read a book in two places at once it is exasperating to attempt to read it in three. And the chapter numbers are not printed at the top of the pages in the commentary, which does not make it simple to find one's way about. These, perhaps, are minor complaints. The translation invites comparison with that of the late Dr Souter (S.P.C.K., 1919), and is commonly to be preferred where they diverge. But Canon Evans does not always avoid obscurity and error here. For example, in Chapter V (p. 135) he has: "Certain people affirm that in Hebrew Genesis begins, *In the beginning God made for himself a son*. Against the ratification of this I am persuaded by other arguments from God's ordinance in which he was before the foundation of the world until the generation of the Son." The second sentence can hardly be called lucid. This is one of those translations where it is necessary to consult the Latin text to discover what it means. The mistake in this instance lies in the wrong meaning being given to *dispositio*, which Canon Evans consistently translates "ordinance" without considering that from Tertullian onwards the word is also found in the sense of "state" or "condition," like the Greek *diathesis*.

For the text he uses the material assembled by Kroymann in his edition for the Vienna Corpus (1906). But he has also been able to put to good use the emendations of C. H. Turner (*J.T.S.*, July, 1913), and has proposed several emendations of his own. Modern works, it seems, have not been accessible to him, and the writings of continental philologists such as Löfstedt are not mentioned. It is a pity that in his apparatus Canon Evans abbreviates Kroymann as *K*, with the result that the reader must continually remind himself that *K* is not a manuscript; in the introduction (p. 84) he uses the abbreviation *Kroy* which would have been much better. We miss an *index siglorum* on the blank p. 88, and the reader is left to discover for himself that *Eng.* means Engelbrecht.

The commentary provides parallels from other works of Tertullian and from early Christian literature. The comments on Chapter III miss the point: Tertullian argues that belief in the Trinity does not prejudice the "monarchy" of God because the Son and the Spirit are like the members of the royal family or like subordinate

administrators. This simply adapts the rationalization of polytheism found in pagan writers, that local deities are only subordinate administrators for the supreme God. Tertullian does but follow the sound Salvation Army principle "Why should the devil have all the best tunes?" He takes over the pagan argument lock, stock, and barrel.

We are also given eighty-five pages of introduction with discussions on such matters as the Monarchian controversy and the theological terminology used by Tertullian. Canon Evans is critical of Harnack's conjecture that Tertullian uses words like *substantia* and *persona* in a legal sense, and thinks "the philosophical (that is, the logical) sense is the only one worth considering." The examination of these terms is a valuable contribution towards the understanding of his thought.

In general, Canon Evans has assembled a lot of useful information in this book. It would have been a better book if he had been able to take some account of the writings of others. He promises in his preface to give similar editions of other works of Tertullian in the future, and concludes: "If circumstances should give me leisure, it would be my ambition to supply the second volume of Tertullian's works, which was promised fifty years ago in the Vienna Corpus, but which has not yet appeared, nor, in the present state of continental scholarship, is likely to appear for many years to come." It should perhaps be observed that the second volume has been published, the first part of it containing the *Apologeticum* in 1939, and the second part, edited by Kroymann, in 1942.

H. Chadwick.

Queens' College,
Cambridge.

Dante the Philosopher By Étienne Gilson. Translated by David Moore. Sheed and Ward. 15s.

This is an excellent translation of Prof. Étienne Gilson's study *Dante et la Philosophie*, which was published in 1939 as Volume XXVIII of *Études de Philosophie Médiévale*. Its object, as Prof. Gilson says in his Preface, is "to define Dante's attitude or, if need be, his successive attitudes towards philosophy." In doing this, the distinguished historian of medieval philosophy has given us a book which is indispensable not only for the understanding of the *Divine Comedy*, but also for the understanding of the *Banquet* and the *De Monarchia*, which are the preludes to the great poem.

The opening chapters deal with Fr Mandonnet's book *Dante le Théologien*, and, in an inimitable way, demolish that eminent scholar's strange exposition of the various metamorphoses undergone by Beatrice—according to his theory—in the work of Dante, by which she represents in turn Theology, a Number, Baptism, the Tonsure, Minor Orders, a Cord, a Bishop, and the Light of Glory.

Prof. Gilson points out the obvious fact that Dante loved Beatrice primarily as a chivalrous poet of his time loved a lady of his time. Those who cannot understand what chivalrous love meant in the Middle Ages are unable to fathom how a man in his right mind

could have written of a human being as Dante wrote of Beatrice. She is the lady who is the source of "valore" and of virtue, and she is the inspiration of his verse, of whom he had purposed "to say what was never said of any woman."

Beatrice is, therefore, not an abstraction—she is not Theology, but she is his saint in Heaven, his heavenly protectress. On the other hand, as Dante plainly tells us, the *donna gentile* of the *Banquet is* Philosophy, Dante's new discovery and new passion, though not a passion that ousts religion and, with it, Beatrice from their proper place. Philosophy comes, indeed, as his comforter after the death of Beatrice. But it is Ethics, and the Ethics of Aristotle, that Dante exalts, even, it would seem, in a sense above metaphysics, because it is the human science *par excellence*, within man's scope, and pertaining to man's temporal perfection in political society. Metaphysics would be first if only it were not so much beyond man's reach.

In Ethics Aristotle is the supreme authority just as the Emperor is supreme in the political order. But each needs the other, and the Emperor should govern his policy by Philosophy (Ethics) in order to make possible that temporal felicity for the establishment of which the Empire was ordained. Each authority is independent and is given of God—"Aristotle and the Emperor, radically distinct in their functions, radically independent but closely associated for the purpose of leading the people to the natural goal of man." There is no room for a third authority above them—they hold directly of God, and the Pope cannot take away what God has once given. God has subjected the domain of the natural reason to Aristotle and that of the human will to the Emperor—there is no element left of the natural life of men over which the Pope can claim any authority.

It is hardly necessary to point out how far removed this doctrine is from that of St Thomas and how subtly it has been devised to prepare the way for the *De Monarchia*, the final justification of the independence of the Empire. "The temporal happiness of the individual through human wisdom—this, then, is the lesson that the *Banquet* teaches. The temporal salvation of humanity through the Empire—such will be the conclusion of the *Monarchy*. The eternal salvation of men through the Church—this will be the ultimate teaching of the *Divine Comedy*."

In the *De Monarchia* Dante sets out to reveal the truth about Monarchy, the ultimate truth which no one has explained before. And, indeed, no one had as yet dared to set up above the universal Church a universal Empire, whose ruler is a kind of secular Pope, ruling with the aid of human wisdom according to the precepts of the Nicomachean Ethics. Without a universal community there can be no peace, and if no peace, then no justice, no human beatitude. And all this at a time when the Empire was at its lowest ebb—yet when the Empire and an Emperor seemed to Dante a necessity if Florence, Italy, and the Christian world were to be saved and saved in spite of the Papacy, which had arrogated to itself powers that God had given irrevocably to another.

What then is the rôle of the Pope, who is still for Dante th Vicar of Christ and the successor of Peter? "We owe to the Sovereig Pontiff," says Dante, "not what we owe to Christ, but what we ow to Peter." In other words, the Pope has no temporal control ove the temporal power; he can only shed a light of grace, a kind o blessing over it. There are, therefore, three independent orders— the human order, the political order, the order of the Church, an whatever the "good Friar Thomas" might teach, Dante remained un moved.

And now Prof. Gilson shows us why Siger of Brabant, the "Lati Averroist," appears in Paradise under the sponsorship of St Thomas and Joachim of Flora, the apostle of the Fraticelli, under that of S Bonaventura. St Thomas thoroughly disapproved of Siger's Aver roism, but Dante needed someone to stand in Paradise for pur philosophy and Siger performs that symbolic function: Dante ha no regard at all for St Thomas's feelings. Neither has he regard fo the feelings of St Bonaventura, who looked upon Joachim "as a justl condemned ignoramus." Bonaventura points out the Calabria Abbot to Dante, because Joachim is there to represent the spiritua order in its purity and independence. And Solomon is in Paradis too in a representative capacity. He is the type of the Emperor wh is the Emperor of Dante's scheme, independent of other earthl authority and ruling according to justice.

Dante was neither an Averroist nor a Joachimite, but becaus everything must be made subject to his own scheme, that of th "mutual independence of the temporal and spiritual orders of th Church and the Empire," both Thomas and Bonaventura must obe his will. It will be realized from this brief summary of Prof. Gilson' brilliant and fascinating book, in which he displays great learnin and critical power, what a light it throws not only on Dante's philo sophy but on Dante the man and the way in which he deliberatel fashioned a scheme of things that would solve his own persona problem and would, so he really seems to have believed, prepare th way for the temporal deliverance of Florence, Italy, and the Chris tian world.

F. J. E. Raby.

Jesus College,
Cambridge.

Vom Menschen. By Hans Ehrenberg. Schriftmissions-Verlag, Glad beck. N.p.

Dr Ehrenberg is one of the best known figures in the ecumenica world. He is also one of the few German refugee pastors who ha returned from England to Germany since the war. He therefore en joys a unique knowledge of the thought and life of the Church i the two countries during and after the war, and what he has to say i of singular interest and importance.

This book obviously bears marks of his experiences. The subject the doctrine of man, is suggested by his English contacts. Dr Ehren berg was a member of the Hawarden Natural Law Group (se

Natural Law, A Christian Reconsideration, edited by A. R. Vidler and W. A. Whitehouse), and this book is dedicated to that group. If, however, the subject is characteristically English, the method of approach is typically German. For it takes the form of "A Journey with Man through the Bible," as Dr Ehrenberg entitled the work in an earlier draught which the reviewer was privileged to see while the author was still in England. The journey begins with man's expulsion from Paradise and ends at the gates of heaven. A halt is made at several main stations—just outside the gates of Paradise, then at the murder of Abel, Noah and the Flood, Abraham and the election of Israel, Moses and the Law of Sinai, the prophets and the monarchy, Zion, the Sermon on the Mount, and Golgotha. At each point we discover something further about Natural Law as revealed in the Bible.

Dr Ehrenberg is often very difficult to understand. It is a comfort that even German theologians say the same! But where he is intelligible, he always has something illuminating to say, some acute observation to make. The fertility of his brain is stupendous. He ranges over a wide field, and makes penetrating observations on such diverse matters as the right interpretation of the Lutheran doctrine of total corruption of human nature as enshrined in the Formula of Concord ("man is poisoned, not the poison"), the comparison of Bolshevism and Nazism (the former denied the first table of the law, the latter the second, and the denial of the second has the more pernicious consequences), the struggle for existence, suffering, work, modesty, and clothing (Catholics err in their love of finery, Protestants are religious nudists!), the intermediate values and the significance of classical Greece, sin and crime, humanism (of which the prophets are, surprisingly, the Biblical exponents), Dr Aulén and the three theories of the atonement, the philosophical significance of the stimulant drugs of the Indians and the narcotic drugs of the Chinese, the antisemitism of Karl Marx, Pascal, Goethe, and the future of theology. There is scarcely a question which Dr Ehrenberg does not touch, and wherever he is understandable he is thought-provoking.

While he is ready to recognize Natural Law outside of the Bible, he thinks that this extra-Biblical Natural Law is on its last legs, and while he deprecates Christians hastening its demise, he thinks they should let it die a natural death. That thesis is questionable as far as this country is concerned, and I should have thought it was in Germany too. The recent war seems to have revived and strengthened the concern of non-Christian European humanists for human values (see for instance the recent Christian News-Letters and the discussions of Professor Hodges in the Third Programme). Surely it is in the interests of Christianity to help in this recovery of non-Biblical humanism, and not let it die a natural death just as it shows signs of revival. And surely this is theologically right, if with F. D. Maurice we are prepared to welcome every manifestation of the Light which lighteth every man. While we would agree wholeheartedly with Dr Ehrenberg in his insistence on *solo Christo*, yet

we are not prepared to restrict Christ's voice to the Bible alone. All the same we joyfully welcome his assertion that "The Bible, which yesterday seemed suspect even to Christians because it was old-fashioned and out of date, has to-day ceased to need defending on this charge. The greatest reactionary in the world to-day is the man who thinks he can repudiate the Bible—and the holy Church—in the interests of humanity. It is not only reactionary, it is stupid."

The great value of this book, in the opinion of the reviewer, lies in the way it will force Christians in Germany, especially theologians, to concern themselves with a department of theology which they have long neglected—the Christian doctrine of man. And it does so by a method which will find ready acceptance over there—namely, from the Bible. The declaration at the Eisenach Conference last July, "Siehet den Menschen," suggests that Dr Ehrenberg has struck while the iron is hot.

Reginald Fuller.

Edgbaston.

The Armour of Christ. By B. J. Kelly. Clonmore and Reynolds. 8s. 6d.

It is true to say that by far the larger number of the classics of Christian Spirituality have been written by catholics in communion with the See of Rome. The mystical and ascetical writings which inform the spiritual life of many Anglicans come from this source. *The Armour of Christ* is a short treatise on practical Christian Spirituality especially written for Irish folk in the conditions of this modern age. Many pages glow with real devotion, coupled with sound Christian doctrine concerning God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, and the Church. The central part contains an exposition of the theological virtues—Faith, Hope, and Charity. It sheds many a light on these virtues, especially the section on Hope, though a "schematic framework" of a doctrine of grace, with a sharp analysis of its action and characteristics, obtrudes itself from time to time. A great deal of the verbal analysis of grace seems to bear no relationship to any observable or experimental reality. This, no doubt, will be put down to the ignorance and untheological character of Anglican theology. The great value of the book lies in its reaffirmation that all men are called to such perfection according to their particular vocations, and the author is deeply moved with the necessity of spiritual teaching and exercise bearing fruit—the fruit of holiness in the actual concrete world in which we live, the world of domestic, social, and national problems, the neighbourhood we cannot avoid. Particularly interesting is the treatment of the contemplative and active vocations in the Body of Christ and the meaning of the "mind of Christ." The Gospel is re-echoed in the profound recognition that "God so loved the world," and the book will lead many to a more dedicated life to God and to man.

What are we to say of the last chapter, "Mary, the Mother of Christians"? The position assigned to our Lady is one which the author admits is most difficult to those outside the "true fold," and

the seemingly competing claims of God, Christ, and Mary "prove a source of intellectual and spiritual embarrassment to many within the fold." Now let it be admitted that the practical (though not the biblical, credal, and in part liturgical) recognition of the pre-eminence of our Lady suffered an eclipse in the reaction of the reformation, let it be granted that officially the Anglican communion has sought to redress the balance in various ways and in particular that many Anglicans teach and practise a veneration of our Lady in art, prayer, hymnology, etc., what a great gulf remains "fixed" between this and the teaching of this last chapter. The author writes with deep faith, conviction, and reverence, but there are passages deeply disturbing which we refrain from quoting. By a very subtle, *syllogistic* mystical interpretation of Holy Scripture, by the transference of a series of human analogies to the realm of revealed truth, the doctrines concerning our Lady are built up. Have Anglicans faced this teaching? Is it deeply embedded in the teaching of the Fathers? If it is true Christian and Catholic doctrine, what a gulf there is between us! We sadly need a discriminating history of this development. Making every allowance for the fallacy of arguments from silence, it is very difficult to believe that, say, the Apostle Paul as we know him historically would have understood this chapter, though no doubt it may be added the celestial Paul sees things differently.

CYRIL GARDNER.

WANTAGE.

THE EUCHARISTIC HYMNS OF JOHN AND CHARLES WESLEY. By J. Ernest Rattenbury. Epworth Press. 15s.

This important book (admirably produced and fully documented) will be of the greatest value to the hymnologist and religious historian and theologian alike. It is written by a famous Methodist leader and writer (now in his seventy-seventh year). The book is divided into three parts. Part I. The Christian Sacrament: the titles of the four chapters speak for themselves: (1) Background, (2) A Protestant Crucifix, (3) Symbol and Instrument, (4) Realized Eschatology. Part II. The Christian Sacrifice: (1) Priesthood and Sacrifice, (2) Sacrifice and the Altar, (3) Sacrifice of the Church, (4) The Eucharist and modern Methodism. Then follows three short Addenda, entitled "The American Orders," "Apostolic Ministry and Validity," and "Constant Communion" (a reprint of a sermon by John Wesley). Part III consists of a reprint of Dr Brevint's famous tract "The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice." Then follow the entire 166 "Hymns on the Lord's Supper."

In a brief review of this inspiring book we can refer only to a few of its excellences.

1. The dates matter. Charles Wesley's Hymns on the Lord's Supper (John wrote only a few of them) were originally composed before 1745. For the first six years of the Methodist movement Charles was a great itinerating minister like his brother. The Eucharistic hymns are the fruit of his evangelical experiences. Many of

them are biographical. His inner life is disclosed by the hymns—indeed, they may be called his *journal intime*. And these hymns must be read against their eighteenth-century background, not in the controversial atmosphere of the post-tractarian mid-nineteenth century.

2. Throughout the whole book the author brings home to us what the Holy Communion really meant to the Wesleys (and to the first two generations of their followers). John Wesley in one year received the Sacrament once in every four days. Anglicans should ponder on the facts stated (on p. 5) about the large and embarrassing attendances at the Lord's Supper. Here is one out of many. "Bolton.—We had 5 clergymen and 12 or 1300 communicants. The Master of the Feast was with us as many found to their unspeakable comfort." Compare with this the fact that Archbishop Secker, when Bishop of Oxford, found it necessary to recommend at least one celebration between Whitsuntide and Christmas.

3. A fundamental section of the book is the reprint from Dr Brevint. Daniel Brevint (1616-95) was, during his exile in Paris, chaplain to Turenne. He wrote a tract on Holy Communion for the sake of Turenne's wife. After the Restoration he came back, and eventually was Dean of Lincoln for eleven years. This practical and devotional tract lies behind the Eucharistic Hymns. Charles Wesley turns the devotional theology of a High-Church Caroline into the flaming Methodist evangel.

4. Throughout the whole book Dr Rattenbury deals with the doctrinal significance of the hymns. The meanings of controversial words such as "priesthood," "sacrifice," and "altar" are courageously faced. The literary merits of the hymns are not discussed. This question was abundantly dealt with in the author's previous book on *The Evangelical Doctrines of the Hymns* reviewed in Theology, No. 260.

The book is full of good things: for example, the answer to Professor Laski's taunt against Methodism (p. 66); the paragraphs written round a reference to Bernard Shaw's "Search of the Black Girl to God" (p. 111); the pungent reference to the atomic bomb (p. 115). On p. 22 there is a fine description of Isaac Watts's "When I survey the wondrous cross." It is designated *A verbal Crucifix built up of carven words*. The paragraphs concerning "Hymns of the Mixed Chalice" (p. 35) will come as a surprise to many Anglicans.

F. H. Durnford.

Longhoughton Vicarage.

The Christian in Philosophy. By J. V. Langmead Casserley. Faber and Faber. 18s.

The problem of the possibility and the validity of a specifically Christian philosophy has exercised the minds of a good many Christian thinkers in recent years; both Maritain and Gilson have discussed it at length, and one of the leading Christian philosophers of our own land has been recently quoted as saying that the real ques-

tion that has to be considered is not whether it is possible for a philosopher to be a Christian, but whether it is possible for a Christian to be a philosopher. Mr Casserley has temporarily deserted his special domain of sociology to intervene in the debate, and he has succeeded to a remarkable degree in producing a book which is original and exciting without being superficial, and which is encyclopædic in its scope without being dull. It is much to be hoped that this work will be read by students of philosophy in our universities; it would do much to deliver them from that sense of being gradually and remorselessly eviscerated, which is so frequently productive of disillusionment and cynicism.

Mr Casserley's book falls into two parts. In the first, which is entitled "The Past Record of the Christian in Philosophy," he gives a thorough if rather breathless outline, which in 120 pages takes the reader from Paul the Apostle to Kierkegaard and Sartre. "The advent of Christianity," he tells us, "forced a new problem upon the attention of the ancient world—the problem of the singular," and, although many Christian thinkers failed to realize it, this is quite different from the problem of the particular and the universal. It is because he thinks they saw this so much more clearly than St Thomas did, that Mr Casserley considers the authentic Christian outlook to be reflected in the representatives of the Christian Platonist and Augustinian tradition rather than in the Aristotelian and Thomist. For him St Thomas is the great apologist rather than the great philosopher; for the purpose of Christian philosophy is not to argue from the world to God but to show that the Christian doctrine of God makes real sense of the world. It was Scotus and not Thomas, we are told, who really understood the significance of the singular. I am not sure how far Mr Casserley is fully just to St Thomas; it is unfortunate that Maritain's and Gilson's discussions of St Thomas as the authentic existentialist did not appear in time for him to take note of them. And I am quite sure it is false to describe the Angelic Doctor as a conceptualist. Mr Casserley is, however, on firm ground when he comes to the modern philosophers; particularly happy is his emphasis on the importance of Vico, with his contention that perfect knowledge of an object is possible only to its maker. Kant, we are told, is the critical figure in modern philosophy; and idealism, positivism, and existentialism all stem from various elements in his thought.

The second part, entitled "The Present Opportunity of the Christian in Philosophy," begins by stating the problem of the Christian philosopher both objectively and subjectively. Christianity is based on the Bible, and ther fore must defend the possibility of theological discourse against the logical positivists. The attempt of some Barthians to steal the positivist thunder, therefore, will not do. God is the Absolute Singular, and how can we talk about the singular? (This, it will be remembered, was Dr Farrer's problem in *Finite and Infinite*.) Partly by analogy and paradox; and we may wish that Mr Casserley had told us more about the communicative validity of the latter. But also by love, for love is a kind of knowing, and it is always

the singular in its uniqueness that we love, never the instance of universal.

Mr Casserley discusses in succession the three prevalent reactio to the present "poverty of philosophy." Logical positivism is dea with sympathetically but drastically. Historical relativism is judge as being right in its emphasis upon history, for the objects of histo are always singulars (Collingwood saw this), but as being wrong i its relativism, and indeed as being self-refuting, for the philosoph himself is immersed in history; in so far, therefore, as the method historical relativism is successful it shows itself to be untrue. Am neo-scholasticism is inadequate not so much because its metaphysi is prescientific as because it is prehistoric; it fails to take account the singular.

What, then, is the task of Christian philosophy? It is to apply th singularistic metaphysics of the Bible to the interpretation of ever branch of human thought and activity; "the vocation and destiny the Christian philosopher is . . . to interpret the world to the Churc and the Church to the world."

The above account of Mr Casserley's book is far too brief to b adequate, but it may give some indication of its importance. I d not think, indeed, that it is free from criticism on points of detai in particular, I think that Mr Casserley is more of a Thomist an that St Thomas is more of an existentialist than Mr Casserley think they are. But I am quite sure that this is one of the most importan books on philosophy from the Christian standpoint that has bee written for a very long time, and its author is to be congratulated o having found time, among his other duties, pastoral and academic, t produce so outstanding a work.

E. L. Mascall, O.G.S.

Christ Church,
Oxford.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Church and the Social Order. By S. L. Greenslade. S.C.M Press. 6s.

During the last academic year I was invited by the chaplain of on of the Cambridge colleges to meet a group of undergraduates wh had been much disturbed by reading Mr Joseph McCabe's littl book on the social record of Christianity, and were at a loss fo an answer. How I wish that I had been able to take with me, an still more to leave behind, Professor Greenslade's *The Church an the Social Order*, which might have been written to meet the nee and suggest the answers to the questions fired at me. For within th modest compass of 120 pages he presents a synoptic view of the rela tions of the church and society during the nineteen hundred years o its history. It would be superfluous to praise the wide knowledg displayed; but perhaps only readers who have tried their own han at similar feats of comprehensiveness and compression can full understand the astonishing measure of lucidity and succinctnes

which Professor Greenslade has achieved. That he is well informed goes without saying; but he is also scrupulously careful not to overstate the matter and to give full weight to the failures and partial successes of the church. This moderation and at times understatement are amongst the most valuable features of his book. At the same time he reminds the reader, even the Marxist readers if such there be of books like this, of the Christian premises on which the argument must be conducted: that man is not destined to an automatic perfection, either as an individual or in society; that Christianity is concerned with man as an immortal soul and cannot accept therefore the yardsticks of any materialist or hedonist philosophy of life; and that notwithstanding its other-wordly relevance, it is neither indifferent nor hostile to man's wellbeing in this world.

There is little which a reviewer can say in detailed commentary on such a book as this. Each individual reader may think that he would have preferred some other examples known to himself to the particular illustrations chosen by Professor Greenslade; but the essential thing is the admirable proportion preserved in each chapter. In the first chapter, which deals with the early church, and in the last, which deals with the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in England, Professor Greenslade is able to bring out more clearly the distinctive achievements of the church than in the chapters dealing with the Middle Ages where church and state were so closely associated as to make the drawing of lines of demarcation more than usually difficult. But he has kept his eye fixed on the proportion of the book as a whole, and has resisted the temptation to give more space to the brighter epochs of Christian history and thereby to avoid the more melancholy ages of decline. This is a book which merits the widest possible circulation and reading. It fills a gap which I do not know to be otherwise filled; it recalls Dr J. K. Mozley's little book on *The Achievements of Christianity*; and like it, this volume is especially commendable for its learning and restraint.

NORMAN SYKES.

CAMBRIDGE.

INKY BLOSSOMS. By C. B. Mortlock. Macdonald and Evans. 8s. 6d.

This is a collection of the Round-About Papers which Urbanus has contributed to the *Church Times*. For many years they have been the most agreeable feature of that paper, and thus assembled they make an excellent bedside book.

RICHARD CAMERON: THE LION OF THE COVENANT. By Andrew Veitch. Pickering and Inglis. 8s. 6d.

A popular biography. The story is told vivaciously, but without fanaticism; it casts an interesting sidelight on Scottish history in the latter part of the seventeenth century.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Oscar Pfister, *Christianity and Fear* (30s.).

A.P.C.K. (DUBLIN): John Watson, *The Literary Qualities of the Prayer Boo* (1s. 6d.); H. M. Harriss, *Draw Near With Faith* (1s. 6d.).

BASIL BLACKWELL: H. D. A. Major, *Lambeth and Reunion: A More Excellen Way* (6d.); J. R. McCallum, *Abelard's Christian Theology* (7s. 6d.).

CASTERMAN (TOURNAI): *Les Exercices Spirituels de Saint Ignace à l'occasion d 4e centenaire de leur approbation* (42 frs.).

JAMES CLARKE: J. W. Woolgar, *This Sacramental Universe* (12s. 6d.); Joh Owen, *The True Nature of a Gospel Church and its Government* (*1689*) (5s. H. H. Kramm, *The Theology of Martin Luther* (10s. 6d.).

DESSAIN (MALINES): A. Croegaert, *Les Rites et Prières du Saint Sacrifice de Messe; III, La Messe des Fidèles* (140 frs.).

EPWORTH PRESS: Edward Langton, *Essentials of Demonology* (15s.).

FRIENDS OF LINCOLN CATHEDRAL: J. H. Srawley, *The Book of John de Schalb concerning the Bishops of Lincoln and their Acts* (1s. 6d.).

HARPER (NEW YORK): Walter Marshall Horton, *Toward a Reborn Churc* ($1.50).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: Leslie E. Cooke, *Faith Stakes a Claim* (6s.); John Murra *The Bible and Our Prayers* (4s.); P. T. Forsyth, *Positive Preaching an the Modern Mind* (10s. 6d.).

KAISER VERLAG (MUNICH): K. Barth, J. Daniélou, R. Niebuhr, *Amsterdam Fragen und Antworten* (DM 1,65); Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Ethik* (n.p. Walter Zimmerli, *Das Menschenbild des Alten Testaments* (DM. 1,35).

LONGMANS: Evelyn Underhill, *Meditations and Prayers* (3s. 6d. cloth; 1s. 3 paper); Richard Acland, *Nothing Left to Believe?* (8s. 6d. cloth; 5s. paper

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: R. R. Osborn, *Holy Communion in the Church of En land* (8s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: J. N. Thompson, *I Want to Live!* (6s.); *Difficulties* (4s.); Lindsa Dewar, *Psychology and the Parish Priest* (5s.).

NATIONAL SOCIETY AND S.P.C.K.: Dorothy E. Baker, *The Psalms and the Use in Religious Instruction* (9d.).

OLIVER AND BOYD: T. F. Torrance, *The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostol Fathers* (12s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: Reidar Thomte, *Kierkegaard's Philosophy Religion* (18s.).

RECUEIL SIREY (PARIS): *Le Cinquantenaire de la Faculté de Droit canonique Paris: compte-rendu des solemnités et des travaux* (n.p.).

REINHARDT (MUNICH): E. Pfennigsdorf, *Der Menschensohn* (Fr. 7.50).

RINEHART (NEW YORK): Brooke Peters Church, *A Faith for You* ($3.00).

ROCKLIFF: Hans Lassen Martensen, *Jacob Boehme: His Life and Works* (21s.

SATURN PRESS: I. M. Holmes, *In Africa's Service* (6s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: St John B. Groser, *Politics and Persons* (7s. 6d.); F. H. Braban *Neville Stuart Talbot, 1879-1943: A Memoir* (8s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: H. D. S. Sweetapple (Ed.), *Parochial Sermons of Bishop Chavas* (9s. 6d.); G. C. L. Lunt, *In Simple Language* (6d.); *The Broadcast Psalt (Words Edition)* (4s.); H. Ernest Roberts, *Medieval Monasteries and Mi sters* (12s. 6d.); John Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress* (a complete dramatiz tion by Rodney Bennett) (2s. 9d.); Harold Anson, *T. B. Strong: Bisho Musician, Dean, Vice-Chancellor* (8s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K. FOR THE CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY: F. J. Shirley, *Richard Hook and Contemporary Political Ideas* (14s. 6d.).

WATTS AND CO.: Llewelyn Powys, *The Cradle of God* (8s. 6d.); A. G. Whyt *The Story of the R.P.A., 1899-1949* (5s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher

HEFFER'S of CAMBRIDGE

will pay good prices for

THEOLOGICAL BOOKS

especially the following:

Andrewes (Lancelot). Works; **Biblia Sacra Vulgata,** good editions; **Darlow & Moule.** Bible Society Catalogue; **Edersheim.** Jesus the Messiah, 2 vols; **Harnack.** History of Dogma; **Julian's Dictionary of Hymnology; Kierkegaard.** Any books; **Lightfoot.** All commentaries; **Ramsay (W.M.).** Any books; **Robertson.** Grammar of New Testament Greek; **Schurer.** Jewish People in the time of Christ; **Schweitzer.** Any books; **Adam Smith.** Jerusalem, 2 vols; **Stone.** History of the Doctrine of the Eucharist; **Streeter.** Four Gospels; **Swete.** St. Mark and Apocalypse of St. John; **Temple.** All major works; **Thackeray.** Grammar of Old Testament Greek; **Underhill.** Mysticism; **Westcott.** St. John's Gospel; **Westcott.** Epistles of St. John; **Westcott.** Hebrews; **Law (Wm).** Works, 9 vols; **Lightfoot.** Apostolic Fathers; **Moulton & Geden.** Concordance to Greek New Testament.

and for standard books on any subject

W. HEFFER & SONS LIMITED

PETTY CURY

C A M B R I D G E

THE SCOTTISH PRAYER BOOK

By A. C. DON 6s. 6d.

The Dean of Westminster has collected a number of unusual photographs illustrating the history of the Scottish Prayer Book. Round them he has written this fascinating and scholarly study which will be of enthralling interest to many outside the ranks of the Scottish Episcopal Church; to the members of that Church, naturally, it will prove especially valuable.

THE BOOKE OF COMMON PRAYER OF THE CHURCHE OF ENGLAND:

ITS ORIGIN AND REVISION, 1549-1661.

By Professor E. C. RATCLIFF 10s. (*Ready in August*)

This is the book specially commissioned by S.P.C.K.—whose whole history has been bound up with publishing the Prayer Book — to commemorate the Quater-centenary of the First English Prayer Book. In a brilliant introduction the most eminent living Anglican liturgist summarizes the story of the Prayer Book and, in brief but meticulously scholarly notes, introduces the 80 full-page facsimiles which fully document his subject. This beautiful book is in Royal 8vo. (10 ins. × 6¼ ins.)

S·P·C·K

Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2

RICHARD HOOKER AND CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL IDEAS

By F. J. SHIRLEY, M.A., Ph.D., F.S.A. 14s. 6d.

This study of the "poor obscure English priest" will be of great interest and value to students of history, political theory, and theology. The book contains a detailed discussion of the vexed problem of the authenticity of the seventh book of the Ecclesiastical Polity. In the last chapter the author deduces from the premisses of Hooker what would be his position in answering the questions of disestablishment and reunion with non-episcopal churches.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS OF BISHOP CHAVASSE
Second Series: FROM TRINITY TO ADVENT

Edited by H. D. S. SWEETAPPLE, D.D. 9s. 6d.

Many besides those who knew and revered Bishop Chavasse will be grateful for this collection.

THE LIFE OF T. B. STRONG
BISHOP, MUSICIAN, DEAN, VICE-CHANCELLOR

By HAROLD ANSON, Master of the Temple 8s. 6d.

This is a book about Victorian Oxford, just when the old clerical Dons were vanishing, and a new type was emerging. T. B. Strong was one of the most brilliant and amusing personalities of his day in Oxford University life; a leader among new and brilliant Liberal Churchmen, and a keen and competent musician.

MARCION AND HIS INFLUENCE

By E. C. BLACKMAN 12s. 6d.

Mr Blackman, in this scholarly and well-documented study, considers, from the dispassionate viewpoint of to-day, Marcion's work as the organiser of a Christian Church, as Biblical critic, canon-maker, textual emendator, and theologian. He has attempted to trace the effect of Marcion's work in the larger context of Catholic Christianity, and presents an estimate of Marcion's significance in the history of Christianity.

TERTULLIAN'S TREATISE AGAINST PRAXEAS

By E. EVANS 21s.

This is an edition of the Latin Text fully annotated, and with a new translation appended. It is designed for students, and should be a valuable contribution to the resources of scholarship.

CAPTIVE IN BABYLON

By MANASSES 2s. 9d.

There are certain books, small as well as great, which become spiritual classics, even though their initial appeal is limited. This small book deserves the attention of any priest engaged in directing souls, or any Christian consciously called to the devout life.

THINK AGAIN

By GORDON W. IRESON 2s.

This book is a direct challenge to the Christian who goes to church only to make use of the Occasional Offices. It shows how complete a change in our conventional notions is required to accept the Christian Gospel.

S · P · C · K

Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.2